THE BAPTIST AGAINST THE PAPIST:

OR,

The SCRIPTURE and *ROME* in Contention about the SUPREAM SEAT of JUDGMENT, in CONTROVERSIES of RELIGION.

Together with

Ten *Arguments* or *Reasons*, discovering the present Papal Church of *Rome*, to be no true Church of Christ.

WHEREIN

It is also evinced, That the present *Assemblies* of *Baptized Believers*, are the true Church of Jesus Christ.

By THO. GRANTHAM, a Prisoner for Truths sake.

Luke 16.29,31. *They have* Moses *and the Prophets, let them hear them. —If they hear not* Moses *and the Prophets, neither will they be perswaded though one should rise from the dead.*

Ezek. 20. 18,19. *But I said unto their children— Walk ye not in the Statutes of your fathers, &c. —I am the Lord your God, walk in my Statutes, and keep my Judgments, and do them —*

Joh. 12.48. *The Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge you in the last day.*

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1663.

BODLEIANA · BIBLIOTHECA ·

THE AUTHOR TO THE READER.

Courteous Reader,

NOt because I envy those of the Papal Church, or desire them any evil; Not that I desire they should be exposed to a suffering condition for matters of Religion, or that they should be denied any liberty in that respect which I desire my self, nor for any other prejudice (God knoweth) do I publish this small Treatise: But because I judge my self concerned at this time to give my Testimony for the Truth, against some Papal Tenents; for divers causes: As first,

I am at this time under restraint, and though nothing hath been laid to my charge, yet it is rumour'd by some that I am a Papist; yea, in this place of my Confinement, have I been told to my face by some of the Protestant Clergie, that I am a Roman Jesuite. And indeed this is an ordinary aspersion which hath been cast upon those in general to whom I am related upon a religious account, viz. That we are all Papists, or will turn Papists, &c. and this, not so much to our personal prejudice, as to the dishonour of that antient way of Truth by us professed. Secondly,

A more particular occasion of the publication of this Treatise, proceeded from the Papists themselves, in sending Seven Queries to the Baptized Congregations in this County (commonly called Anabaptists) To which, through the importunity of some Friends, I formed a brief Answer; little thinking, I confess, that so much contention would have risen thereupon, as since I have met with. And I likewise confess, that the undertaking is such, as that it requireth a more fit Instrument than my self to manage it.

Nevertheless, I hope I may say, that hitherto what hath come to pass in this contest, hath fallen out rather to the furtherance of the Truth; for which cause I have thought fit to offer it to the perusal of others, so much of it I mean, as I conceive is at present needful; and that is the substance of what hath passed about the means whereby we must decide or resolve Controversies in Religion.

It

It now wants but few months of a year, since I sent my final Answer, containing a Review of all that had been said in way of Answer to the Queries *before, in which I produced the Testimony of divers Antient Doctors, as concurring with what I had therein spoken, and, as being directly opposite to my* Antagonist.

But I have heard of late, that he is gone out of this Nation, so that I expect no more Reply from him. And though for divers Reasons hereafter shewed, I have not published the whole Discourse (which, if need be, may in due time be brought to light) yet I have thought it meet here to set down all the Seven Queries, *that so if any Christian, of suitable endowments, for the Vindication of Truth, against the opposition that lyeth in the said* Queries, *shall think fit to lay forth his Talent in that Service, he may take hold of this occasion wherein to do it, (for the* Queries *were not directed to any particular person) however, I shall joyn to each Query, one* Antiquery, *which may serve at this present to blunt the edge of them, as they carry an opposition to the Truth.*

The QUERIES.

Query 1.

WHether we are to resolve all Differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God?

Query 2.

How know you precisely what is the true Word of God?

Query 3.

How know you that your Copies and Translations of the Bible are the true Word of God? since the Original Writings are not come to your hands.

Query

The ANTI-QUERIES.

Antiq. 1.

WHat *Differences in point of Religion can you resolve without the written Word of God? and whether the written Word of God be a perfect Rule for matters of Religion?*

Antiq. 2.

Whether some Book must not of necessity speak for it self? and whether the Scripture doth not best deserve this privilege? And whether it be not a bold presumption to say, there are no holy Books but them which we or you have received for such, sith those which we have, tell us, there are other holy Writings, which never yet came to our hands, nor to yours?

Antiq. 3.

What Copies and Translations of the Bible have you that are more true than ours? and where are the Original Manuscripts of the Prophets and Apostles?

Antiq.

Qu. 4.

Where we differ about the sense of the Word, by whom must we be tryed? the dead Letter cannot explain it self.

Antiq. 4.

When we differ about the true Church, and about the meaning of Authors, by whom must we be tryed? They cannot speak for themselves more than the Scripture: and whether the Scriptures, compared together, do not explain themselves? also, whether it be not an opprobrious and ignominious speech for you to call the Scripture a dead Letter? *and whether the true lovers of the Scripture ever vouchsafed it such ill, and indeed improper language?*

Qu. 5.

What clear Text have you out of Scripture for the procession of the holy Ghost from the Father & the Son? or, for changing the Sabbath from *Saturday* to *Sunday*? or prohibiting Poligamy, or Infant-Baptism? And whether there be not as clear Texts to prove unwritten Tradition, *Purgatory*, and the *real Presence*?

Antiq. 5.

Whether the Baptism of the true Church be not one? and whether that one be not expressly found in the Scripture? And whether the Scripture doth not prohibit all beside that one? And whether the Papists have not confessed in many of their Books, that Infant-Baptism is not found in, nor grounded upon the Scripture? and then, whether it be not clear, that all the Texts which speak of Baptism, do not prohibit Infant-Baptism? Also, whether Joh. 15. 26. *and* 14. 26. *and* 16. 7. *be not clear Texts that the holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son? Also, whether* 1 Cor. 7. 1, 2, 3. *do not as much prohibit one man for having two Wives, and one woman for having two Husbands? and whether it do not clearly prohibit the latter? Also, whether there be any that hold the first day under the notion of a Sabbath among the Baptized Churches? and yet whether there be not clear Texts for the religious observation of it?* Act. 20. 7. *Also, whether it be not absurd for you to ask for clear Texts to prove unwritten things? Also, whether Purgatory, and the Real Presence, as you hold them, be not plainly destructive to some Articles of the Christian Faith?*

Qu. 6.

Qu. 6.

VVhether Universality both for time and place, be not an evident mark of the true Church?

Antiq. 6.

What Church can you name that hath that mark? And whether the Woman that John *saw, was not* Rome? *And whether her Cup was not universally received, so that all Nations were drunk thereby?*

Qu. 7.

Whether you have really this mark, that is, whether you can fetch out of all Ages and Nations, Professors of your Religion; in particular, you are desired to name but one or two in the first six hundred years after Christ of your Profession; for example, such as held the sole-sufficiency of Scripture for deciding Controversies, and denied the lawfulness and usefulness of Infant-Baptism?

Antiq. 7.

Whether any man can shew this mark, as it is here call'd for, without the help of humane History? and whether humane History be a rule or ground for divine Faith? And whether humane Histories (especially those of the first three hundred) after Christ, were not most, if not all, burnt, which concerned the Church? and whether those that remain are not contradictory one to another? Also, whether Infant-Baptism was so much as heard of in the first hundred? and then, how could any be named that denied the usefulness thereof? Also, whether a Church, whose gathering, constitution and government is answerable to the Scripture, be not the true Church of Christ? And whether the Churches of the Baptists do not therein exceed all other whatsoever?

Thus, Reader, I have given thee some account of the causes why I publish this Treatise; I desire thee to peruse it diligently. If in any thing the Truth be dishonoured, through any Error maintained by me, (of which yet I do solemnly profess I am not conscious to my self) then do not forbear to blame me in a christian sort: only, if thou perceivest me deficient in point of Language and Method, I desire thee to bear with that; for I am one that gets my bread by the labour of my hands, and never saluted the Schools to gain the knowledge of their Arts.

From the Common-Goal in the Castle of *Lincoln*, the 10th of the 11 month, (commonly called *January*) 1662.

Farewel.

TO

TO THE

Nameleſs Author

OF THE

VII. QUERIES;

And in him, to all the SONS of

PAPAL ROME

In the County of *LINCOLN.*

HItherto the things pertaining to Religion, as they concern the Baptized Congregations, (commonly called Anabaptiſts*) and you that are commonly called* Papiſts*, have been very little controverted. And whether it ſhall ever pleaſe God to try his Peoples Faith and Stedfaſtneſs, by your open oppoſition, as he hath done it by others, I may not preſume to determine; nor doubt I, but if it ſhall ſo fall out, he will advance his Truth thereby.*

It is moſt certain, that of thoſe many wayes whereby the antient path of the Goſpel hath for a long time been oppoſed, there is not found any more potent than yours; and the rather, becauſe your ſubtilty is utterly unknown to the generality of Chriſtians in this Age and Nation, where your Religion hath, as it were, lain dormant for many years.

The moſt dangerous ſtratagem wherewith you uſually aſſail your oppoſits, is, your denyal of the Scripture, &c. the high doom of Judgment in matters of Faith; and aſcribe that dignity to your ſelves, under pretence of your being the Church; wherein if you conquer any one, your work is, as it were, wholly accompliſhed.

Whereupon, I have here preſented to the world, ſomewhat of your skill, in this important Queſtion, Whether we are to reſolve all Differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God? *yea, I have faithfully tranſcribed your laſt Reply to my Anſwers, which contains the ſum of what you ſaid in all your other Papers. Whereby the Reader will diſcern (if I think right) wiſdom uſed to the hurt of them that have received it. I have forborn at this time to publiſh all that hath paſſed*

between

between us about the ſeven Queries; *partly, for that one thing is oft repeated in our ſeveral Papers; and partly, and indeed eſpecially, for that it is to little purpoſe to controvert any particular point of Religion, till we be agreed about the Judge, that muſt determine our Differences. Now, whereas you do aſcribe this Prerogative to your ſelves, under pretence of your being the Church of Chriſt, I have therefore laid down ſeveral Reaſons, by which it may appear, that you are not the Church, and ſo not that Judge, whereunto you pretend to be ſo willing to adhere.*

I have likewiſe ſhewed, that we, your oppoſits, have the true claim to the title of Chriſt's Church; that ſo, if you will appeal to her, you muſt then appeal to us; which yet we believe you will not be perſwaded to, nor indeed do we deſire you ſhould, whilſt this is the Queſtion, Whether we, or you, be the Church? *No, we are content to ſay with* Auguſtine, Ask not us *in this caſe,* we will not ask you, but let this matter be tryed by the Scripture: yea, *ſaith he,* let the Prophets, Chriſt, and his Apoſtles be Judge. *Yea, we ſay further in his words, Let matter with matter, cauſe with cauſe, reaſon with reaſon, counted by authority of the Scriptures, not proper to any but indifferent Witneſſes to both parts.*

Auguſt. *contra* Max. *l.* 3. *c.* 14.

My final Anſwer to the firſt of the ſeven Queries, *I have here publiſhed, with as little alteration or addition as poſſibly I could, to give the Reader a true underſtanding of the matters in difference. And if you publiſh any thing hereupon, I deſire no fairer dealing from you, than you have in this caſe from me.*

I have ſeriouſly conſidered what ſhould be the deſign of your Queries; *and hitherto it appears to be chiefly, to exalt the authority of mens Traditions, above the lively Oracles of God,* the Scriptures. *For though it ſhould be granted (which you can never prove) that there hath continued a true Church at* Rome *ever ſince it was there planted; yet would it not follow, that all which your Church holdeth under the title of* Eccleſiaſtical Tradition, *muſt needs be obeyed by us; for it is certain that the* Jews *did retain the ſtate of a true Church, when yet their Traditions (however by them accounted) were but the Traditions of men, which both the Prophets and Chriſt himſelf, termed* vain Worſhip; *eſpecially ſuch of them as made void the Commands of God, as we are ſure many of yours do: and therefore, as Chriſt ſaid to them,* Why do you tranſgreſs the Command of God by your Tradition? *the ſame we are humbly bold to ſay to you, when you ask us, why we tranſgreſs your Traditions? for ſurely, of none can it more fitly be ſaid than of you,* that laying aſide the Commandments of God, you hold the Tradition of men.

Mar. 7.

THO. GRANTHAM.

THE BAPTIST AGAINST THE PAPIST.

The FIRST PART sheweth, the SCRIPTURE and ROME to be in Contention about the SUPREAM SEAT of JUDGMENT in Controversies of RELIGION.

THE first of all Controversies is founded upon this *Query*: *What is the authoritative Judge of Controversies?* And indeed till there be some agreement in this point, there can be no expectation of any fruitful issue of any Controversie.

Now all Controversies amongst the sons of men, are reduceable to one of these two heads, namely, *things humane*, or, *things divine*; things precisely pertaining to this life, or things which only pertain to that which is to come; concerns of a *secular consideration*, or concerns of a *religious consideration*. And according to the nature of these Controversies, such ought the Judge for decision thereof to be.

Concerning this Judge of *Religious Controversies*, there are divers opinions. Some say that the *Light*, or that of God in *Every Man*, is this only infallible Judge of all Religious Controversies. But if this be admitted, a multitude of inconveniences must needs follow, of which this is not the least, That there can be no end of Controversies, because, if every man have this Judge of all Debates in himself, and he aver, that what he saith and doth is according to the voice of this Judge (or, *that of God in him*) no man can take in hand, to judge contrary thereunto, without becoming the Judge's Judge,

and ſo violate the Rule propoſed. For this opinion refers not doubtful matters to that of God in ſome men, or a ſelect number of men, but to that of God in every man.

There is another Opinion, which ſaith, That amongſt all men which pretend to own Chriſt, and challenge to themſelves the title of his Church, and yet do deny each other to have an intereſt in that title; That amongſt all ſuch parties of the ſons of men, the only infallible and authoritative Judge of their *Controverſies about Religion*, is the LORD Himſelf, as he ſpeaketh by his Spirit in the holy Scriptures; together with *right Reaſon*: or thus, which is all one, The Apoſtles and Prophets, as they ſpeak *in* their holy Writings, are the onely infallible authoritative Judge in theſe Controverſies. Yet three things are in this Opinion allowed: firſt, That the living voice of the Paſtors (with the Church) in their reſpective Ages wherin they live, are of great importance in order to the terminating ſtrife in the Church, as a Church. Secondly, That Records of Antiquity are of ſome uſefulneſs for the reſolving ſome Controverſies, and for the better diſcovery of ſome Errors, yet not ſo abſolutely neceſſary, but that the Church may ſufficiently reſolve her Controverſies without them. Thirdly, That there is a Judgment of Science to be allowed every man, as touching all things which he chuſeth or refuſeth in matters of Religion, to be uſed with moderation and diſcreet ſubjection. And this is the Opinion to which for my part I do adhere.

There is another Opinion which ſaith, That the Papal Church of *Rome* is the Supream Judge and Catholick Moderatrix of all Diſputes in matters of Faith, and that *All* are bound to hear and obey her Voice under pain of Damnation; and that the Scriptures, as taken in the ſecond Opinion, is not the Judge of Controverſies. Now this is the Opinion which at this time I am to examine, which in much ſeriouſneſs I humbly purpoſe to do, and leave it to the ſober conſideration of all men.

And for the better diſcharge of this duty, it is meet we ſhould underſtand what the *Papiſts* mean by the Church of *Rome*. And this I find, that under that title they would involve the whole Church of Chriſt from the Apoſtles dayes until this preſent time, at leaſt all the Faithful ſince the time that *Paul* declares the *Roman* Church to have been famous, as *Rom.* 1. 8. But this is the very thing denied by us: for though we willingly grant that there was a very famous Church at *Rome*, when *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to them; yet it followeth not, that there is ſuch a Church there now, or that all that

ever

ever from that time to this have walked in the steps of true Faith, must needs be supposed to have been Members of the *Roman Church*, or rather of the Church of *Rome* (so called) especially since it was Papal. So that in this Controversie they must be content to define the Church of *Rome* on this wise, (*viz.*) All that in any Age since Christ, was of the same Faith and Practice in things religious, which is at this day found in the Papal Church of *Rome*, and those only, are the persons of whom the Papal Church of *Rome* doth consist. And indeed this is as much as they can reasonably desire; for if those holy men who lived in times past, were of a Faith and Practice contradistinct to that which *Rome* hath now received, Then may not the present Papal Church without wrong, challenge them to be of their Church? As for example: *Paul*, who bore witness for Christ at *Rome*, and the Christians there in his dayes, was of the Church of Christ at *Rome*; yet we deny that they were any part of the Papal Church of *Rome*.

The Church of *Rome* therefore, defined as before, I do deny to be the infallible authoritative Judge of all Controversies about matters of Faith or Religion: And I do further say, That the Scriptures and right Reason, as laid down in the second opinion, much more deserves to be received for this supream Judge of Controversies, than the Papal Church of *Rome*: and that there is not an other Umpire that can so effectually decide the Controversies of Religion, which depend between such parties of men as lay claim to the Title of Christ's Church, and yet deny each other to have an interest therein.

And how far forth the truth in this Point hath been evidenced in that *pro* and *con* Discourse (so far as it relateth to the first of them) which hath been occasioned by the writing of the *Seven Queries* I have before spoken of, is here offered to the Consideration of all sober men, that profess to own the Glorious Gospel of the blessed God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. The *first Query* of the *Seven* was this, propounded by the nameless Papist.

PAPIST.

Whether we are to resolve all differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God?

BAPTIST.

To which Question these ensuing Answers were given before I received the Adversaries last Paper, which, with the Answers thereunto,

unto, I will transcribe *verbatim*. I say the Answers were,

That the word *Controversies* being understood of such Controversies only as depend between those parties of men who deny each other to be the Church; that then there is no other way whereby *WE* can resolve those Controversies, but by the assistance of God's Spirit speaking to us [through the undoubted Prophets, and Apostles, and Primitive Churches] in the lively Oracles of God, the Scriptures of Truth, together with the help of right Reason in a way of subserviency to those divine directions. Or, if the word Controversies, shall relate only to all such Controversies as fall within the compass of the Church, that then to the former means, we are to joyn the living Voice and Authority of the Church (in present being) assembled with her Pastours, as the ordinary means appointed of God to terminate strife in the Churches. But if the Division in the Church be so great, as that it be not this way decisive; or the Doubt so secret, as not this way to be resolved; there is not then a better way, than for both Parties to reason it out till Truth and Innocency do prevail, as the two Tribes and an half did with the other Tribes of *Israel*, and prevailed, *Joshua* 22. or in some doubtful cases the use of Lots may be admitted for the resolution of them, *Acts* 1.

PAPIST.

It is worth observing, how many windings and turnings you have to avoid the difficulty of this Query; Whether we are to resolve all differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God? *First, you leave out the word* [only] *in which lay the very knot of the difficulty.* 2. *Then you give me a piece of an Answer, and keep in* the living voice of the Church, *as a reserve for your Second Paper.* 3. *When you are shewed how you forsake your old fort,* the sole sufficiency of Scripture, *as if you were afraid to come too near us, you give back again, and do your worst to discredit this* living voice of the Church, *so that in effect it stands but for a meer cipher, as I foresaw it would when it came once to the scanning.* 4. *Upon second thoughts, finding your error, by putting the* Query, What is become of the living voice of the Church? *you shuffle again, and would gladly make something of it; but this something, in the end, falls to just nothing, as I shall make it further appear by ripping up the particulars of this your last Answer.*

BAPTIST.

I have used no windings to avoid the difficulty of the *first Query*; but you are to know, that when I first answered it, I took the word

Controversie

Controversie, to relate only to such Controversies as depend between such persons as deny each other to have any present right to either the Name or Priviledges of the Church. And indeed, I do not see how any other sense can be made of this *Query*: for, under that word *WE*, I suppose you included no more but your self and Church, on the one party; and us, to whom you sent the *Queries*, on the other party; and we well know that you account us no members of the Church; and you likewise know that we have the same opinion of you; but when your Observations (or Second Paper) took into the *Query* all Controversies which fall within the compass of the Church, as such, I could do no less than tell you, that my Answer did not exclude the *living voice of the Church* in such cases; [but that my Answer doth only exclude every such voice as exalteth it self above the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures: And whereas in your Third Paper, you told me, That to appeal to Councils and Fathers, is a clear way to agree all our differences; I told you that this is a very cloudy way, and that because they are contrary to themselves, and one another. 2. Till they be agreed, they cannot agree us. 3. And sith you take not the Scripture as being of any authority, till they, as the Church, give it you; I demanded, by what you would agree them in their divisions? 4. And to shew you how they are divided, I gave you divers Instances concerning their divisions, as also touching the corruption which hath been found in divers Popes.]

PAPIST.

1. *I had no reason to take notice of your excluding from the living voice of the Church*, every voice exalting it self above the voice of Scripture, *because it was a very needless Exception, since the Church arrogates no such power, but only to interpret the voice of Scripture.*

2. *Why this way of taking the sense of Scripture from the living voice of the Church, should be so cloudy as you say it is, I do no more understand, than that the living voice of a Judge should be a cloudy way to understand the Law by.*

As for your Riddles, how we are to reconcile the Fathers and Councils when they seem to clash with their own Assertions, but by having recourse to Scripture: I Answer briefly, That General Councils have no such contradictions as you speak of. And as for the holy Fathers, when there is any such difficulty in any one of them, we must look upon the rest what they say, and to follow their unanimous consent: for if we take them singly, no doubt they have erred, and these errors we know by their dissenting from the rest; for otherwise, certainly the authority of any one of the antient

antient Fathers, when he expounds Scripture, or relates the Chriſtian practice of his time, and is not cenſured or contradicted by the reſt, or condemned by the Church in a General Council, is of greater authority to decide Controverſies in point of Religion, or to know the true meaning of Scripture, than any thing you have alledged, as we ſhall ſee by and by, when I have firſt examined what you bring to diſcredit the Fathers and Councils.

Againſt the Fathers, you firſt bring St. Aug. retract. 21. contradicting himſelf by ſaying, that, Matth. 16. Chriſt built not his Church upon Peter, but upon Peter's Faith: ſure you read not St. Aug. for he there expounds that place of Chriſt himſelf, and not of the Faith of St. Peter; nor doth he recal his expounding it elſewhere of St. Peter, but leaves both Expoſitions as probable, concluding thus; Hunc autem ſententiam quæ ſit probalitur eligat lector. Is this fair dealing? Again, you bring in St. Aug. contra. Petil. c. 2, 3, 4. as contrary to himſelf and me, becauſe he teaches, That the Church is to be found out by the words of Chriſt. But though (I doubt) you cannot make this appear in any of theſe three Chapters, yet were it nothing to the purpoſe; for we deny not but the Church is to be found out by theſe clear marks, whereby the holy Scripture hath deciphered her.

Next, you alledge St. Chryſoſt. in Pſal. 22. and St. Ambroſe de Sacrament. calling the Bleſſed Sacrament, a ſimilitude or figure of Chriſt's Body and Blood. I Anſwer. 1. That it is the Opinion of the Learned, that neither St. Chryſoſt. nor indeed any Grecian, could be Author of that work. 2. I ſay, the Sacrament may be truly called the ſimilitude of Chriſt's Body and Blood, becauſe it is not given in the form of fleſh and blood, of which men would have a horror, as the ſame St. Amb. obſerves, but under the Forms of Bread and Wine.

The next is St. Dinis Eccl. Herarch. but quoting no place, I have not yet met with it; I am ſure that work is ſo clearly for us in this very point, that our Adverſaries the Calviniſts, and Calvin, denies it to be his: St. Aug. and Tertull. are as clear for us, and what you bring out of them clearly anſwered by Bellarm. de Euchar. And you are to know that it is a general rule amongſt the Learned, that we are to explicate obſcure places by thoſe that are clear, if we mean to know the Opinion of any Author, it being impoſſible for any man to write ſo warily, but that ſomething may be objected out of him (eſpecially if he have writ much, as it is our caſe) which may ſeem contrary to what he expreſly teaches. And you had need obſerve this rule in expounding the Scriptures themſelves, or otherwiſe you will meet with a thouſand abſurdities and contradictions.

Against the Councils you produce that of Constantinople *under* Constant. Copron. *as crying down Transubstantiation. But this was a factious Meeting, never owned for a Council, neither by the Greek nor Latine Fathers, and expresly condemned in the* Nicene *Council: and the jest is, this Mock-Council was so far from condemning Transubstantiation as you affirm, that they swore by the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, to abolish the Worship of Images:* [Something should here have been said concerning *Bertram*, who is said to have opposed Transubstantiation; but in the transcription of my Third Paper, there was an *Errata*, and the Instance is not material; so that what is said about him, I will expunge in both Papers.]

You say further against the Authority of Councils, That they have contradicted each other in their Decrees, about the Laityes communicating in one or both kinds: But we grant that the Church may vary in Customs of this nature, which being indifferent, may be altered as she shall think fit, according to several circumstances: What we deny is, that the Church, or General Councils ever made contrary Decrees about the belief of any point of Faith.

It is no wonder that you have a fling against the Pope, after you have been so bold with Holy Fathers, and General Councils; but I must tell you, Though many of our Divines hold him infallible, when he speaks ex Cathedra, *as they call it, yet is it not the Opinion of all, and consequently no Article of our Faith. Only we agree in this, That for preserving peace in the Church, all are bound so far to submit to the Popes Decrees, as not to oppose them until a General Council be called, from whose Judgment we admit no Appeal. What you say of the wicked Lives of some of them, is nothing to the purpose; for as wicked* Caiphas *play'd the Prophet, so might the Bishops of* Rome, *with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, be true interpreters of God's Word, for all their wicked lives; such* Gratia gratis date, *which are given for the good of others, do not argue his Sanctity that hath them.*

To make you a true Prophet, I will here cry out, What is become of the living voice of the Church, since you have done what you can to discredit her, by casting all the dirt you can in her face, as it is evident, unless you will throw out the Holy Fathers and General Councils (the Churches Representatives) out of the Church!

BAPTIST.

I perceive our Judgments differ concerning *the living voice of the Church*, what it is? I have told you, That I take it for the present Church and her Pastours, in those particular Ages wherein they

live. You take this *living voice* to be the Decrees of Councils, and Books of the antient Fathers. And here I cannot but marvel, why you ſhould be willing to Appeal *to* the Books of the Antients, and their written Decrees, as *a living voice*, and *clear way* to decide our Controverſies, and yet appeal *from* the Books of the Prophets and Apoſtles, as being *but dead Letters, and ſenceleſs Characters*. Certainly, if any Writings now extant, may be called *the Churches living voice*, the Holy Scripture doth better deſerve that title than any other. Nor will it ſuffice here to object (as it is the Papiſts uſual way) that our difference is about the Scripture and the Senſe thereof, *&c.* for the ſame difference is found amongſt us, touching the Books and Senſe of Councils and Fathers: yea, I think I may be bold to ſay, That even the Learned are ſo much divided concerning them in both reſpects, as that they can never be therein reconciled.

But is it ſo? that the voice of the Fathers, *&c.* who only ſpeak in their Writings, is a means or way of equal clearing to decide our differences, as the voice of a living Judge in a Caſe of Law amongſt men? Then what reaſonable man can render a reaſon, that the voices of the Prophets and Apoſtles, though only ſpeaking to us in their Books and Decrees, may not be appealed to, as a clear way to decide our differences? Sith all men, profeſſing Chriſtianity, muſt confeſs that the Prophets and Apoſtles ſpeak with as much Life and Power, Certainty and Authority, as any that ever writ ſince their time: Nowhither now can you turn your ſelves, but to your ſelves (as I have formerly noted) and take upon you to be the *only* living voice, that muſt, without controul, interpret Fathers, Councils, and Scriptures too; and when you have done, ſit down as Judge, to give Sentence for your ſelves, and againſt your oppoſers.

Well, you have aſſigned us a Judge of Controverſies; To wit, the Fathers and Councils of the Church (long ago deceaſed) and this is a clear way, you ſay, to agree all. But I have noted that it's a very cloudy way, and that becauſe they could not yet agree themſelves; for they are oppoſite each to other to this day, inſomuch as you are utterly unable to reconcile them, ſince (as I have ſhewed) you muſt not make uſe of the Scripture to that purpoſe; becauſe, before the Scripture can have any authority to any purpoſe, (according to your Judgment) your Councils muſt deliver it to us as the Word of God; which they cannot do till they be found, Firſt, holy Fathers and Councils of the Church; And ſecondly, at unity among themſelves, and each with himſelf. And I have asked you, How you will effect this difficult work? To which you Anſwer; Firſt,

That

That General Councils have no such Controversies as I talk of. Secondly, *That when there is such difficulty in any one of the Fathers, we must look upon the rest what they say, and so follow their unanimous consent; for* (say you) *if we take them singly, no doubt they have erred, and these errors we know by their dissenting from the rest.*

I answer first, That General Councils have erred, and that in matters of Faith, is undeniable, if Records may be credited rather than you. As first, The Council of *Arimi.* did err so, as to conclude for the *Arrian* Heresie, namely, That there was a time when Christ was not the Son of God: and sure you account that an errour in point of Faith. Secondly, The Council of *Ephesus* did err so, as to conclude for the *Eutichian* Heresie, namely, That the Body of Christ was not of one Substance with ours; and is not this an errour in point of Faith? Or will you say, that these things were never contradicted and censured by other Councils? These things are not denied by your eminent Disputant. See the Book intituled, *Certamen Religiosum.* So then it appears, that General Councils have erred, and contradicted each another in very high points of Faith.

These were both General Councils

Moreover, as to the things whereof I chiefly spake in my last Paper, it is manifest that Councils have contradicted one another about the Sacraments; for the Council of *Constance*, confirmed by Pope *Martin the Fifth*, doth curse the Laity, or excommunicate such as receive the Sacrament in both kinds. And yet by the Council of *Basil*, the Laity are allowed to receive it in both; which Council was also confirmed by a Pope, namely, *Felix the Fifth.* Sure one of these Councils must needs err. But you have a way to salve this errour (such as it is) and that is to tell me, *That the Church may vary in customs of this nature.* Sure this is a corrupt opinion, by which it will follow, That we have no certainty of, nor constancy in any Ordinance of Christ; for if the Church have power to take the Cup away, she hath power also to take the Bread away; for certainly she hath as much to do with the one, as the other. But truly this your variation, as it is clear beside the Institution of Christ, and the Doctrine of *Paul*, so it hath in a manner destroyed both Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord, as is evident by the practice used in divers of your *Masses*, where the People partake neither of the Bread nor Cup. As also your *Peda-Rantism*, hath in a great measure defrauded the Sons of men of the Baptism of Repentance.

Mat. 26 1 Cor. 11

But be pleased to consider, that this your sacrilegious division of this Sacrament, is condemned by *Cyprian*, *Gelasius*, and others. First, *Cyprian*

Cyprian Serm. Penet.

Cyprian saith, *How can we exhort the People to shed their blood for Christ, if we deny them the Blood of him?*

Gelas. consec. Dist. 2. *The division of this Mystery cannot be without great Sacriledge,* saith *Gelasius.*

Again, you cannot be ignorant how the Council of *Carthage*, decreed the Books of *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Sapience*, and *Maccabees*, should be received for Canonical, notwithstanding they were rejected out of the sacred Canon by the Council of *Laodicea*; and here by the way I may take notice, how you would have me walk by such a rule as you your self do not observe; for you propose the Judgment of those who lived neareſt to the Apostles times, as my safest rule to walk by, supposing they knew the Mind of God, or Christ, better than those that came after; but then why do you reject the Judgment of the *Laodicean* Council, which is more antient than that of *Carthage*, which yet you follow in receiving the Books of *Maccabees* into your Canon of holy Scripture.

Secondly, It is marvellous to see, what work you make in reconciling the Fathers without the Scriptures. And seeing you are so hardy as to undertake this task without Scripture, as undoubtedly you see you must, or else grant, that the Scripture must be that whereby we must decide all Controversies in Religion; for certainly, if we must decide all the Fathers Controversies in Religion with or by the Scripture, it is not then very likely that either we or they should decide ours without them: but I say, sith you have undertaken to decide the Fathers Differences without Scripture, pray tell me, before you meddle with their Differences, how you know them to be holy Fathers of the Church? can you prove them Church-members without Scripture? I believe this is as hard a task as to reconcile their Differences without Scripture; and yet this also must you do, before you can look upon the Scripture as any Rule for either them, or your self.

You tell me, if I take the Fathers singly, no doubt they have erred: yet you say I must follow their unanimous Consent, (a pretty Paradox) Follow their Consent! in what? why say you, in their Interpretation of Scripture. Of Scripture! Why there is no such thing as yet for them to interpret; for you know (that by your own direction) we have laid by the Scripture, and must reconcile these Fathers by themselves. Miserable Guide! hast thou not led me into a Labyrinth, and run thy self into a sufficient Maze? I'le back again and see how these Fathers themselves direct me in this difficult point. And first I meet with famous *Augustine*, who tels me how he took

notice

notice of the Fathers that were before him. Saith he,

My consent without exception I owe not to any Father, were he never so well learned, but only to the Canonical Scripture: For whereas the Lord hath not spoken, who of us can say it is this or that? and if he do say so, how can he prove it? Yea, saith he, *I require the voice of the Shepherd reade me this matter out of the Prophets, Psalms, the Gospel, or the Apostles Epistles.* Neither (saith he) *ought we to take the dispensations* OF ALL MEN, *how* CATHOLICK SOEVER *they be, or be they never so commendable as* we take *the canonical Scriptures, as though we may not (saving the honour that's due to such men) reprove or refuse any thing of their Writings, if we find they meant otherwise than the Verity doth allow, by the help of God found by us, or by others.* Again, he saith, *I am not moved with* Cyprian's *Epistles; for I do not take the Letters of* Cyp. *as the Canonical Scripture, but I do try his Writings* BY THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURE; *and whatsoever in them doth agree with the Authority of the holy Scripture, I do receive it with his Commendation; and whatsoever doth not —— I do by his good leave refuse it.* *Aug.* de Nat. & Grat. *Aug.* in *John.* Tract. 94. *Aug.* ad *Fortunat.*

And for further testimony of *Augustine*'s integrity, hear what he saith of himself: *Trust not me,* (saith he) *nor credit my Writings, as if they were Canonical Scripture, but whatsoever* THOU *findest in the Word, although thou didst not believe it before, yet ground thy Faith on it now; and whatsoever thou readest of mine, unless thou know it certainly to be true, give no certain assent unto it.* Again, he thus teacheth, *We must be partakers of other mens Writings, wholly after the manner of Bees; for they flie not alike to all Flowers, nor where they sit do they snatch all quite away, but snatching so much as may serve to their honey-making, they take their leave of the rest. Even so we, if we be wise, having gotten so much of others as is sound and agreeable to Truth, we will leap over the rest. Which rule, if we keep in reading and alledging the Fathers words, we shall not swerve from our Profession, the Scriptures shall have the soveraign place, and yet the Doctors of the Church shall lose no part of their due estimation.* *Aug.* Prolog. l. 3. de Trin.

And saith *Origen, We have need to bring the Scriptures for witness, for our Meanings and Expositions without them, have no credit,—— the discussing of our Judgements must be taken* ONLY *of the Scriptures.* *Orig.* in *Jer.* hom. 1.

Thus you see the Fathers were not of your mind, that the Readers of their Books should not try them by the Scripture, but the contrary; and that as we find them consenting to, or dissenting from Scripture (not one another as you teach) accordingly they advise us to believe, or not believe them.

As

As I have ſaid, it is a cloudy way to appeal to Councils and Fathers, ſo you now prove my ſaying true: for I alledged *Auguſtine*, as being oppoſite to you and your Church, touching the meaning of *Matth.* 16. *Upon this Rock*, *&c.* and, firſt, you tell me I read him not; but I muſt tell you, I read him after a Scholar ſufficient: and though your reading differ ſomething from his, yet they both deſtroy the received Opinion of your Church concerning that Text; for if Chriſt be that Rock, as you confeſs *Auguſtine* there teacheth, then it cannot be meant poſitively of *Peter*, and ſo not conſequently of your Popes.

My quotation out of *Chryſoſtom* in *Pſ.* 22. you invalidate, by telling me, that Book was not writ by him. And this I find to be the uſual way of Learned-men, when the paſſage alledged is clear and convincing, then a ſuſpition muſt be caſt upon the Book, &c. I could inſtance the beſt part of a thouſand Books, Epiſtles, &c. which are intituled under the names of the Antient Fathers; amongſt which, as you obſerve, is reckoned the Book of *Dyns* the Areopagite, which I alledged in my Rejoynder. And do not theſe things contribute ſomething towards the proof of my Aſſertion, namely, That it is a cloudy way to appeal to Fathers and Councils to decide Controverſies in Religion. If then your way be cloudy, mine muſt needs be clear, unleſs you can aſſign a third way, oppoſit to both; for undoubtedly there is a clear way to decide Controverſies.

You again preſcribe me a way to find the meaning of the Fathers, and that is, to *explicate their obſcure places by ſuch as are plain*, &c. But by your leave, we can neither know which of their ſpeeches are obſcure or plain, without ſome rule whereby to know this. And now, what can ſupply this our neceſſitiy? For example, *Auguſtine* is ſometimes read, affirming the Sacrament to be the real Body and Blood of Chriſt; otherwhiles he is read directly oppoſit to this: And how can you, or any body elſe, tell which of theſe ſayings is clear or obſcure, ſith none muſt be permitted the uſe of his reaſon (by you) in this Controverſie; and how he ſhould judge according to Faith, I know not, ſith you, as yet, debar us of that by which Faith NOW cometh, namely, the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apoſtles as contained in the Scriptures.

PAPIST.

Something you would ſay for this living Voice of the Church *you once had required as neceſſary to reſolve Differences in Religion, but this ſignifies nothing in our preſent* Query: *for, after all your ſhifting, I cannot perceive*

perceive that you make use of her Authority in point of Faith, (which is our Qu.) but only to take up other quarrels, by exhorting, reproving, &c. and in this also it seems you will be your own Judge, whether she follow Christ or no.

Three things you affirm in relation to the Churches Authority. 1. *That she is to rule her self according to Scripture; which no body denies.* 2. *That the Church in former Ages is not to be a Rule for after Ages to rule themselves by; because she could not foresee the Controversies that rise up afterwards. What if the same Errors be revived now, which in their times were condemned, is not the Judgment of the Church in those dayes a safe President for us to condemn the same Errors? Besides, Is it not evident that the Pastors of the Church, the nearer they were to Christ's time, were the better able to judge of Christ's Doctrine? You say,* 3*dly. That the Church is to be no Rule for those that are out of her communion. A strange Assertion. As if a clear light (as the Church is in holy Scripture) with so many marks to know her by; as Unity, Sanctity, Universality, Miracles, &c. were not a good means for him that gropes in the dark to find out his way. Look well upon these marks, and you will find them to agree Only to the Roman Catholick Church, and to no upstart Congregation, and consequently, that you ought in all reason to give her the hearing in matters of Faith, and to have recourse unto her, as to the pillar and ground of Truth,* 1 Tim. 3. *which place you let slip, and this under pain of being accounted a Heathen, &c.* Matth. 18. *for though this place doth point out chiefly the obedience which Members of the Church owe her in point of Discipline, as you say well enough, yet hath it no small force in our present Debate, since those that will not hear her Voice when she ecchoes out the Voice of God, may well be esteemed by her as a Heathen. And in your own sence I suppose you will have your* proviso, *That the Church is to be obeyed only when she ruleth according to God's Word, of which you will be Judge too: So in conclusion all comes to this, That you and your spirit must be Judge of all Disputes. And then have not I reason to ask again (since I, or any body else, may challenge as large a share in the Spirit and right Reason as you) who shall take up the Quarrel? And is not my comparison here very pat, That there must needs be as great confusion in your Church, as in a Kingdom where every one were left to decide his own case? This was not the old way, as you may see,* Deut. 17. 8, 9. *and* Malach. 2. 7. *which places you had no mind to take notice of: and yet you charge me for letting pass your Instance of St.* Stephen, *concerning the* Libertines, Alexandrians, *&c. which makes nothing at all for your pretended Evidence of God's Word: For though his Judgment might be well taken in expounding Scripture, as being full of the holy Ghost, and confirming what he said by Miracles,*

racles, as the Scripture tells us he did, yet this is not your caſe, for I think you will not arrogate ſo much to your ſelf.

What you ſay of Chriſt and his Apoſtles vindicating their Doctrine out of Scripture, is very true, and our Church doth the ſame: but it is not true, that either Chriſt, or the primitive Saints were alwayes wont to ſend their Proſelytes to the Scripture, to regulate their Faith. Did not Chriſt himſelf ſend St. Paul *to* Ananias *for inſtruction? Had you been of his counſel, you would have rather wiſhed him to look into the Word of God, and ſee there what he was to do. And when there aroſe a Debate, even in the Apoſtles dayes, about the neceſſity of Circumciſion,* Act. 15. *did they not aſſemble the Church, and ſo pronounce Sentence* conciliariter, *with a* viſum eſt Spiritui ſancto & nobis?

BAPTIST.

[It is here worth noting how you diſpute beyond the due bounds of the *Query*, which, as it concerns you *Papiſts* and us *Baptiſts*, hath no relation to the Differences which ariſe in the Church, as ſuch, and indeed you go amiſs in this matter throughout the whole Diſcourſe.]

Here you ſeem to acknowledge, *that the Church ought to rule according to Scripture*; but you will not allow me to judge whether ſhe do ſo or not. But I anſwer, that there is a Judgment of *Science*, as well as a Judgment *Authoritative*; the latter I know cannot be exerciſed by me, nor any other Member of the Church, becauſe this Power lyeth in the Church as imbodied together; but the former, to wit, a Judgment of Science or Knowledge, is particular to each individual, and ſo my ſelf, if a Member of the Church, am allowed the exerciſe thereof, even in matters of Religion, 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. *I ſpeak to wiſe men: judge ye what I ſay.* The Apoſtle doth not here give any wiſe man at *Corinth* leave to judge of that which he ſaid, ſo as to cenſure what he had delivered, yet he muſt exerciſe his underſtanding to judge of what *Paul* had ſaid, thereby to find out the verity of what was ſpoken. But yet I do confeſs, that our caſe, and the caſe of Chriſtians then, do differ: for *Paul* was a Foundation-layer, a Maſter-builder, (ſo that the Members might not ſo well judge then, as now, yet) the Church now is to build upon the Foundation which is laid already: and you know that I have in my Rejoynder acknowledged, that it very nearly concerns particular Members of the Church, to have great regard to the Judgment of the Church, when, after ſerious debate, they deliver their Sentence in any point diſputable. And further (as touching your Church) you tell me anon, that even a Heathen may judge of the

the *holiness* of your Church, by the Law of Conscience; and then, why may he not by the same Law judge your Church concerning her *unholiness*? nay verily, he must be able to speak both wayes, or else he hath no Judgment. And if a Heathen have this priviledge and ability, then why not a man professing Christianity, who hath not only the Conscience-Law, but also the written Law of God, by which he understands things more excellent, *Rom.* 2. From all this I only conclude, that each particular ought to have the free exercise of his Judgment in what he chuseth or refuseth, sith without this he cannot chuse or refuse any thing with confidence, nor to his comfort.

And concerning Controversies in the Church, I do not see that (in these dayes) we are bound to follow the sentence of a multitude, (though assembled in Council) SO, as to hold their Sentence absolutely infallible; for the promise of infallibility is not made to a certain select number * of Bishops, but to the Church, taken collectively; and we may remember that a great Assembly of Prophets in the old Church, erred in Judgment with unanimous consent, when yet the Lord had one *Micaiah* at home which understood the truth of his Will. Wherefore I here conclude, although the Members of the Church ought to weigh with great respect the things concluded of by their Pastors, yet so may it be that they may swerve from the Truth, whilst God clears it up by some particular rather than by such an Assembly. And to this agrees very well a saying of *Gerson*, *If it should so happen that there should be a General Council assembled, in which such a man were present as is well instructed, If the greatest part should decline through Malice or* IGNORANCE, *to the opposition of the Gospel, such a* LAY-*Man may be objected, against the said General Council.* And saith *Panormitan*, *In matters* WHICH CONCERN FAITH, *the saying of a* LAY-*Man ought to be preferred before that of the Pope, if his saying be more probable by better authority of Scripture than that of the Pope.*

* *The Apostles are here excepted*

Gerson exam. of Doct.

Panor. chap. signif.

You often tell me, that to appeal to the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures, &c. is not a sufficient way to decide OUR Controversies, and that because you may challenge them to be for you, &c. To which I answer, by retorting your Argument thus, That which you call *the living Voice of the Church*, to wit, Volumns of Fathers, and Decrees of Councils, is therefore insufficient to decide OUR Controversies, because your opposites do say they are for them, and against you: and now you must answer your own *Query*, viz. *Who must take up this Quarrel?* You answer, that we must *explicate them one by another; the places which are obscure, by such as are plain.* And

then I still ask you, why we may not as well agree our selves this way by the Volumns of the Prophets and Apostles?

I shewed before, how you misapply that Text, *Matth.* 18. and though the case is so plain, as that you cannot defend your self, yet you seem loth to decline your error, and would fasten a very gross passage upon me; namely, that I should say, That the Church is *no Rule for those that are out of her Communion, as not to be a light for such as grope in the dark.* A manifest wrong; I only say and prove, That those that are not of the Church, are not within the power of her Discipline; nor can she reasonably desire unconverted ones to appeal to her Judgment-seat in Controversies between them and her. And I asked you, If you would not scorn us, if we should call upon you to appeal unto us as your Judges, *Whether we, or you, be the Church?* and not doubting but you would, I concluded, that it is equally absurd for you, to desire us to appeal to you as our Judges. But you may find it plain enough in my Papers, That I do believe the Church *SO* to be a Rule to the world, as to shew them the way of Life, and so a good means for their Illumination and Conversion. ——

As for your three Texts, 1 *Tim.* 3. *Deut.* 17. 8, 9. *Malachi* 2. 7. As they do your cause no good, so they do mine no harm: I grant the Church is the pillar and ground of the Truth, and that she hath Power to hear and determine all Controversies among her Members, as aforesaid; and that it is the duty of the Members, to enquire of their Pastors, what is the way of God concerning them: But what of all this? *Ergo*, The Papal Church of *Rome* is the only infallible Judge, and Moderatrix of all Contention about Religion. *Ergo*, we must all appeal to the Papal Church of *Rome*, as our Judge, in this Question, *Whether we be of the Church, or not?* though we be in doubt, Whether she her self be a true Church, or not? yea, though we are satisfied she is not. Are not these *Monstrous* Consequences?

Be it here observed, That I do believe the Church of Christ to be the Pillar of Truth, *so*, as that she was never so over-clouded with error, but that she hath enjoyed the fruition of that Promise, *Matth.* 16. in some good measure ever since it was made: Nor shall she ever *so* close with the gates of Hell, as by general consent, and full authority to dissert that Faith, which having Christ for its object, is the Rock she is built upon: and therefore you see, I hold the Church cannot err (in some sense) and indeed, he that holds the contrary, must (for ought I see) raze out that Promise, *Matth.* 16.

and

and many other. And yet nothing from all this accrues to the Papal Church of *Rome.*

I alledged *Stephen*, as defending the Truth by the authority of Scripture *Only*, *&c.* Nor can it be groundedly imagined, that (had it been the mind of God, *that ſuch as are not of the Church*, ſhould be ſummoned to her Tribunal) *Stephen* (being full of the holy Spirit, the leader into all truth) would have omitted the uſe of that means, but he knew that ſuch authority the Church had none, as I ſhewed from 1 *Cor.* 5. *What have I to do to judge them that are without? do not ye alſo judge them that are within?* And therefore he could not mention any ſuch power. And though *Stephen* did many wonders among the People, yet at this time when he ſo powerfully vanquiſhed his adverſaries, he did none at all, but only overcame them by the aſſiſtance of the Spirit ſpeaking in the Scripture, *&c.* I deſired you to ſhew me *but one* Inſtance, where ever any of the Primitive Saints did appeal to the Church, of which they were preſent Members, as Judge between them and ſuch as never received their Doctrine: but you have not done it, nor indeed can it be done. As I ſhewed, that *Stephen* appealed to Scripture *ONLY*, *&c.* ſo I alſo ſhewed, That it was the way of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, frequently to vindicate their Doctrine *againſt ſuch as were not of their Church*, by appealing to the Scriptue (eſpecially amongſt ſuch as owned the Scripture) this you confeſs; and alſo you tell me, that your Church doth the ſame: But this cannot be true of *All* your Doctrine, becauſe you have told me, That *many Points of your Faith are reſolved without the written Word of God*; or elſe you never anſwered my firſt *Antiquery*, which demandeth, What Controverſie in Religion you can reſolve without the written Word of God? And in your Anſwer you aſſigned, The Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son, Sabbath, Infant-Baptiſm, and MANY OTHER POINTS OF FAITH; and I ſhall ſhew anon, that we have it *pro confeſſo*, from your Champions, that there be ſome Points of your Faith, which is not GROUNDED UPON, nor MENTIONED IN the SCRIPTURES; and therefore your Church cannot vindicate ſuch Points of her Faith and Doctrine by the Scripture.

Although Chriſt ſent *Paul* to *Ananias* for inſtruction, yet it followeth not, that we muſt take *Romes* inſtructions without Scripture. Is there no difference between the time that now is, and then was? Much of the Scripture (if not all the New Teſtament) was then unwritten. Again, *Ananias* was immediatly ſent of God. If you

are *ſo* ſent, prove it to us, as *Ananias* did, by ſhewing the Miracle of reſtoring *Paul*'s ſight. If you are not *ſo* ſent, to what purpoſe do you alledge this Text? I believe I might form you a *monſtrous Conſequence* here.

PAPIST.

You that will not truſt the Churches Judgment, lay down four wayes of reſolving Doubts; The firſt, To argue it out till Truth prevail. *But if we muſt argue only out of Scripture, and be our own Interpreters of it, there can be no end of arguing, as I have often ſhewed. The ſecond,* To appeal to God as the two Tribes did, *Joſh.* 22. *A rare way to end Controverſies, to look for Miracles in our Diſputes. The third,* To appeal to Scripture, and right Reaſon: *But if I challenge them to be on my ſide, who muſt take up the difference? The fourth,* To caſt Lots. *But though the Apoſtles did it, who certainly were inſpired to do ſo, yet muſt not we preſume to tempt God, or to look for the like Miracles, or to build our Faith upon ſuch doubtful events.*

BAPTIST.

You here wrong us, to ſay, that we will not truſt the Judgment of the Church; for the Church, truly and univerſally taken, we do credit, as her that is appointed of the Father, to be the Pillar and Ground of the Truth; of which Church, we take the Prophets and Apoſtles to be the principal Members, and ſo in all Points of Faith, to be credited in the firſt place. But if by Church, you mean the Papal Church of *Rome*, I confeſs we dare not truſt her Judgement, at leaſt, not in all that ſhe ſaith; for example theſe following: 1. Your Church tells us, That it is not needful for the Scriptures to be read to, or by the Laity, in a tongue which they underſtand: and that though they Pray (after another) in Latine, though they underſtand not what they ſay, yet ſuch prayer is ſufficient, *Rhem. Teſt. Annot. in* 1 *Corinthians.* 2. Your Church tells us, That the Sacrifice of your Maſſe, is available to take away, or obtain remiſſion of ſins by the work wrought. *Con. Trident. Seſs.* 22. That the whole Maſſe is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead; and whoſo ſaith, it is only a commemoration of Chriſt's Death, *&c.* is accurſed. *Con. Trent.* 3. Your Church holds, That ſuch as deny that the real Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, is in the Bread and Wine of the Sacrament, ought to be burnt to death. 4. Your Church holds, and tells us, That Images, and old clothes of Saints, ought to be worſhipped with religious Worſhip. 5. That men are AS FULLY Juſtified by good Works, AS THEY ARE DAMNED BY evil

× things

evil Works. 6. That it is unlawful for Miniſters of Chriſt to Marry. 7. That the Scripture doth not contain all things neceſſary to Salvation. To omit many other, theſe are Points of your Churches Judgment, which we dare not truſt, till by you, or ſome other, proved to be Truths.

I aſſigned the uſe of Lots as lawful in ſome doubtful caſes to end Controverſies, and for proof, I quoted *Acts 7.* and this you will not allow for two Reaſons. 1. Becauſe (you ſay) the Apoſtles were inſpired to uſe them; but were it ſo (as that you cannot prove) yet it cannot be denied, but we may do ſome things which they were inſpired to do: for the Holy Ghoſt was to lead them into all Truth, and they were to lead us into the ſame Truth, by their Example and Doctrine, *Joh.* 16. 13. 1 *Cor.* 11. 1, 2. And be it here obſerved, That the Holy Ghoſt led thoſe, our Teachers, to ordain the Miniſtry by Prayer, and laying on of Hands, *Acts* 6, and *Acts* 13. which practice of theirs, is a good preſident to act by; a preſident I ſay; for this practice is not expreſly commanded in Scripture, no more than the uſe of Lots in the election of Miniſters. If it here be objected, That Chriſt might give *laying on of hands* in Precept when he was with his Apoſtles. I Anſwer, So alſo might he give them the other to be uſed, when there might be perſons found of ſeemingly equal fitneſs to ſerve the Church. 2. You reckon the uſe of Lots, *Acts* 1. amongſt Miracles, as your other Reaſon, why we may not uſe them to decide any Controverſie; but why you ſhould ſo do, I ſee no more reaſon, than to ſay *Joſh.* 22. mention'd any Miracles towards the compoſure of the difference between the two Tribes, and *Iſrael*; where in truth no ſuch thing can be found, though you ſeem to affirm it.

PAPIST.

In my laſt Paper, I took notice how you ſent us to Heaven for Miracles, to take up our Quarrels after the Example of Moſes, *whoſe cauſe was cleared that way: Here you deny you brought in the Inſtance of* Moſes *to this purpoſe, which, how true it is, every one that can reade muſt needs ſee. For, are not theſe your words?* But you ſay, Reaſon is on my ſide, *&c.* and demand by whom we muſt be tryed, who muſt take up the quarrel? I anſw. Even the ſame that took up quarrels of this nature in times paſt, *Exod.* 7, *&c. Do you not here tell us plainly, That God muſt take up our quarrels* * AS *he did thoſe of* Moſes? *And truly otherwiſe I might*

* Note, there is not the word *AS* in my words, only I ſay the ſame, that is, *God muſt take up our quarrels*; and how that muſt be, is ſhewed in my Anſwer following.

(*as*

(as you foresaw) very possibly tell you, that your Allegation was nothing to the Question, Who must take up the quarrel? *It is pretty to see what stuff you make of it, and then how you digress, to rail at our Baptism and Pastours; I say, rail: for you bring no proof at all.*

BAPTIST.

I have said enough to satisfie any reasonable man, that it doth not follow from my alledging *Exod. 7.* that I send you, or any body else, to Heaven for Miracles to decide our Controversies. For at the first I shewed, that in the case of *Moses* there was Miracle against Miracle; only God gave a note of distinction between those signs, insomuch as the Serpent that came of *Moses* Rod devoured the other: from whence I only noted, That it's God's way to give some powerful note of distinction, between the Witness of his Servants, and Deceivers. And now, is not this my Observation very pertinent to our case? You say, you are the Church. We say, we are the Church. Here is Testimony against Testimony, as there was Miracle against Miracle; and if the Lord do not now give some powerful note of distinction between our Doctrine and yours, concerning the Church, as he did between *Stephen's* and the *Alexandrians*, I pray, who must take up the quarrel between *U S?* Is it fit that you should be Judge in your own case here? If so, why may not we? If the Councils and Fathers were of the Papal Church, then it is not any more reasonable that you should summon us to their Arbitriment, than it is for us to summon you to the Judgment of our Predecessors; but forasmuch as *you* and *we* are agreed, that the Prophets and Apostles were infallibly assisted to write the Mind of God for us to observe; therefore it's most reasonable that we should both appeal to them. If you object, the Prophets, *&c.* are not alive to interpret their Writings, and that our difference is about the sense thereof; I Answer, This objection is every way as forceable against the Decrees of Councils, and Volumns of Fathers; for their Writings must be interpreted, expounded, *&c.* and we differ about the meaning of them. Secondly, the way you assign us to agree them, is to consult them together, *&c.* Now I would know, why we may not be allowed this way to seek out the meaning of the Prophets and Apostles? In a word, there is not one Objection which yet I have met with, levelled against our appealing to holy Scripture, *&c.* as the only infallible means to decide all Controversies between YOU and US; but the same objections are more forceable against all that you appeal to, for decision of the said Controversies.

PAPIST.

PAPIST.

You except againſt our Miracles, becauſe we bring them to prove our Church by; but if it appear as it doth, that God works Miracles upon thoſe that actually call upon his Bleſſed Mother, and his other Saints, or whilſt they are performing ſome of our Religious practices, which you abhor, is it not an argument that God approves them? It is God then, and not we, that brings Miracles to prove our Church.

BAPTIST.

You will ſtill have your Miracles to be an infallible mark of the truth of your Church, eſpecially thoſe of the Bleſſed Virgin (you mean the Image ſo called at *Loreto*) or as you phraſed it in your third Paper, *The Lady of Loreto*. But let me tell you, that there is ſmall cauſe you ſhould refer me to what is done there, as an infallible mark that your Church is the Church of Chriſt. For by the relation of two eye-witneſſes, which I have read, it is a place of moſt groſs Idolatry, blind devotion, and deceit. One of which Authors, was once a Teacher of your Church, who, before his ſeparation from you, travelled to *Loreto*, to ſee if the *Image of the Virgin* would inform him of the truth or falſhood of the Roman Church, as it is now conſtituted; for he was doubtful in this matter, and had been informed, that if any perſon were guilty of Mortal ſin (which if the Papal Church be the Church of Chriſt, he concluded he muſt needs be guilty of, in queſtioning her, at leaſt in the Judgment of the Fryers, who waited there upon that *Image*) he had been informed (I ſay) that if ſuch as were guilty of Mortal ſin, did but pray before the Lady of *Loreto*, the ſaid *Image* would either bluſh, or fall into a ſweat, and ſo reſolve the Petitioner in the affirmative. But if we may believe the Lady of *Loreto*, and this *Informant*, then it is no Mortal ſin to think, that the Papal Church is not the Church of Chriſt: For this doubtful man prayed earneſtly, and beheld the Lady as ſtedfaſtly, but no ſweat nor change befel her at all. Therefore, according to the Fryers rule, it is no Mortal ſin to think the Papal Church of *Rome* is not the Church of Chriſt.

But this one thing is eſpecially obſervable here, That whereas you would perſwade your ſelf, and others, that I ſend men to Heaven for Miracles to decide Controverſies; it is manifeſt that you are the man that is herein guilty: For the Controverſie is, *Whether the Papal Church of* Rome, *be the Church of Chriſt?* You affirm; I deny. To decide this Controverſie, you refer me to Miracles, as the

ſpecial

ſpecial means, or chief mark, whereby I may be reſolved in this matter, as is evident in this, and your two former Papers; So that what you would caſt upon me, falls clearly upon your ſelf, ſave that, inſtead of ſending me to Heaven, you ſend me to *Loreto*.

[In my Rejoynder I urged, *that of neceſſity the Scripture muſt decide all our Controverſies, as aforeſaid; becauſe, as things now ſtand, the Word (or Scripture) is antecedent to the Church, ſo that inaſmuch as it is impoſſible to find the Church without the Scripture, it ſuppoſes clearly that the Scripture muſt be found before the Church: and ſo, if the Scripture muſt of neceſſity reſolve this great Controverſie about the Church, it conſequently followeth that they muſt reſolve all Controverſies; becauſe all Religious Controverſies are involved in this one general Query*, Where is, and who are the Church?].

Something here, which the Adverſary doth further write, is omitted, becauſe it may be more fitly taken notice of afterward.

PAPIST.

I had reaſon to take notice of your general ſaying, that the Word was antecedent to Faith and the Church, ſince there was a Church, and conſequently Faith before the Scripture was written. Now it ſeems you meant not the Scripture by the Word, but I know not what Word, which was afterward committed to writing. It is paſt my underſtanding what Word you mean; for ſince it cannot be Verbum Scriptum *before it be written, It muſt either be* Verbum Traditum, *and I ſuppoſe you will not allow that; or* Verbum Dei Patris; *and that cannot be the Word you ſpeak of, as committed to writing.*

BAPTIST.

By that Word which was antecedent to Faith and the Church, as it relates to the Church under the Patriarchs, *&c.* I mean the Word which God ſpake to them, and by them, at ſundry times, and in divers manners. And if you take that term [*Word*] to relate to the Church of Chriſt in its plantation, then I ſpeak partly of the written Word of God, and partly of that which was (at that time) only ſpoken by word of mouth, by Chriſt and his faithful Stewards; and if you will call this part of the word, *Verbum Traditum*, I ſay, that is the Word I ſpeak of. And I do alſo ſay, this Word was afterward committed to writing; which Word, together with the former, I mean that of the Prophets, is that whereon the Church (as now conſidered) is founded*, by which ſhe muſt be known. And in this ſenſe, I ſay, the holy Scripture is now antecedent to the Church. And therefore well ſpake that Learned perſon, *Chryſoſtom*, when he fore-

Heb. 1. 1.

* *Not denying Chriſt to be her foundation in the main.*

Eph. 2. 20.

forewarned the ſons of men, that if they took heed to any thing, in order to their knowing the Church (in the latter times) beſide Scripture, they would fall headlong into the Abomination which maketh deſolate, and not be able to know the true Church.

Chriſoſt. Hom. in Mat. 24

BAPTIST.

I Think it meet here to give the Reader ſome account of my Judgment of theſe five Texts, which I brought to juſtifie my Anſwer to the firſt *Query*; which, with my *Anſwer*, was as followeth.

Qu. *Whether we are to reſolve all Differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God?*

Anſw. The Spirit ſpeaking in the Scripture, together with right Reaſon as truely ſubſervient, is that whereby we are to reſolve all Differences, &c. For proof I cited, *Iſa.* 8. 20. 1 *Tim.* 6. 3. 1 *Joh.* 4. 6. 2 *Joh.* 9, 10. 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 2. where note, that under the term *We*, ought not to be underſtood, any perſon but the *Papiſts* on the one part, and the *Baptiſts* on the other, who do deny each other to be the Church of Chriſt.

Now that the Church is to defend her ſelf againſt all that come to ſpoil her of her Church-ſtate, by the Scripture onely (as that which includes her whole ſtrength) is that which I brought theſe Texts to prove.

And firſt for that place, *Iſa.* 8. 20. The Prophet foreſeeing a Judgment coming upon *Iſrael*, even ſuch, as God would hide himſelf from them; and the Law and Teſtimony ſhould be

PAPIST.

ONce more you offer to juſtifie your Conſequences drawn out of the five Texts. But I ask once more, To what purpoſe did you bring them? was it not to prove what you had ſaid in your Anſwer *to my* Query, *That the Scripture, ſo we took right Reaſon along with us, was ſufficient to reſolve all Controverſies in matters of Faith? No rational man can reade your firſt Paper but muſt think ſo; and indeed, otherwiſe you muſt have brought them to prove ſomething that was not under debate, which had been impertinent. Muſt not that very Aſſertion of yours be the Conſequence to theſe five Texts? and then, have I not reaſon to cry out, that there never appeared ſuch Monſtrous Conſequences? But, to avoid this inconvenience you fall into the other, and will have ſome of your Texts brought to prove certain Propoſitions, which you had not mentioned in your* Anſwer. *Howſoever, let us now ſee what you make of them.* Iſa. 8. 20. *God's People are commanded to have recourſe* rather *to the Law, &c. than to ſuperſtitious Oracles,* Ad Legem magis, &c. *And they have a ſign*

BAPTIST.

be like a Book bound and sealed up; as ver. 16 & 17. compared with ch. 29. 11, 12. The Prophet likewise foreseeing, that when God should hide his face, *Israel* would enquire of Wisards, and such as spoke from familiar Spirits (as *Saul* did, when under the like judgment, as 1 *Sam.* 28. 6, 7, 8.) wherefore the Prophet, that he might warn the remnant of faithful ones, whom he foresaw would be as wonders amongst the rest, commands them, as from the Lord, that WHEN men should say unto them, Seek unto such as have familiar spirits, *&c.* to go to the LAW, as being their way to go to God himself: for saith he, *Should not a People seek unto their God? To the LAW, &c.* and certifies them that by that they should know Deceivers; for, saith he, *If they speak not according to This Word*, [the Law] *there is no light in them*: So that I infer thus much, that when such as are enemies to the Church come to invade the Saints with their deceit, the only infallible way to know them to be Deceivers, is, to enquire of God's Law and Testimony. I know that *Israel* had the Testimony or standing Oracle, beside the written Law. And the *Church* now hath the new Testimony open in the *Church*, beside the Law & Prophets; & hereunto, I say, the Church is only to apply her self, as aforesaid, to find out the deceit of those who would rob her of that inheritance, which she holdeth by the deeds of God's Law, and Promises, contained in Scripture

PAPIST.

given them to convince such Oracles of falshood, if they speak not according to the Word or Prophesie *of* Isaiah. *This is the clear sense of that place, out of which you draw this strange consequence.* Ergo, *the Scripture, &c. is to resolve all matters of Faith. A strange Consequence, I say, as will appear, if we turn your Enthymeme into a Syllogism, thus: Recourse is to be had rather to the Law, than to false Oracles, whose falsehood appears, if they speak not according to the Word or Prophecy of* Isaiah. *But if this be so, the* Scriptures, &c. *are to resolve all points of Faith.* Ergo, &c. *What a prodigious* minor *have we here? How doth it follow, that because God's Word is to be more credited than superstitious Oracles; or, that such Oracles are not to be credited, when they speak against God's Word: Therefore the Scriptures, &c. are to resolve all points of Faith. I know you have not the word* rather *in your English Translation as we have in ours, but the clear sense of the place bears as much.*

1 Tim. 6. 3. *saith, they are proud that teach contrary to the Doctrine of Christ.* Ergo, *you infer that the Scripture is to judge whose Doctrine is of pride.*

This

BAPTIST.

Scripture; by these, as the *only infallible Rule*, she knows those to be Syars, *who say they are the Church, and are not.*

And to this agrees the next three Scriptures, the very reading whereof sheweth, that when the Controversie is between the Church and such as pretend falsly to that Title, the onely infallible means to refel them, is, the *Spirit speaking in Scripture, &c.*

For thus saith the first of them: *If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholsom words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Doctrine that is according to Godlineſs, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions, &c.*

Thus saith the second, *He that knoweth God, heareth us: he that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth, and the spirit of Error.*

The third saith thus, *Whoso transgresseth, and abideth not in the Doctrin of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the Doctrine of Christ, hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this Doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.*

From these Texts it appears, that unleſs the *Papists* can produce something which they can infallibly prove to be Christ's Doctrine, beside what is contained in holy Scripture; or, that the Apostles may be heard as infallibly by some other means, as by the holy Scripture; or, that the Saints

PAPIST.

This is as mad a conclusion as the last; for when there is no clear Text of Scripture for either side, as it often happens, or Scripture brought on both sides; How can the Scripture judge whether party be proud? or, how can it be judge of its own sense, when it is alledged on both sides, who both pretend to have the Spirit and Reason on their sides?

1 John 4.6. *Those that hear not the Apostles, are not of God, nor have his Spirit.* Ergo, *say you, the Scripture resolves who are religious: Doth it follow out of this Text, that when parties contend, that they hear the Apostles, the Scripture, can resolve the difference, and pronounce who are religious? &c. Not at all.*

2 John 9. 10. *Gives Judgement against those that follow not Christ's Doctrine. You infer* ergo *the Scripture must try whether men bring this Doctrine. Strange Logick: for unleſs your Text proved that the Scripture containes all Christ's Doctrine, which it doth not, your Consequence must needs be faulty.*

2 Thess. 3. 2. *you say proves, that Reason is some wayes necessary to decide Controversies in Religion. I will not examine the goodneſs of this Consequence, but I am sure you need not have*

BAPTIST.

Saints received some Doctrine for Christs, that is not contained in the Scripture; I say, unless they can infallibly shew something of this nature, my Answer is good. But if they can produce any other thing of such authority, then I acknowledge my Answer to be deficient. Howbeit, if any man, or the Church her self, do decide a Controversie, by insisting upon the Scripture, this is no more than my Answer included; for I do not imagine that the Church must not pronounce what is contained in the Scripture: but if she hath power to speak as from the Lord (in these dayes) when yet the Scripture saith no such thing, then I profess my self short of understanding the power of the Church.

PAPIST.

brought Scripture to have proved so manifest a Truth, which cannot be denied by any, but such as pretend to have so much of the Spirit, that me-thinks they should have little need of the use of Reason.

2 *Thess.* 3. 2. I only made use of this Text thus far, that in Religious Controversies the Apostle gives Reason her place, and therefore desired to be delivered from unreasonable men.

BAPTIST.

Concerning my five Texts, and what I infer thence, *I* need not speak much here; yet it is worthy observing how apparantly you miss the clear sense of *Isa.* 8. 20. whilst you restrain the relatives [this word] to the Word or Prophecy of *Isaiah*, whereas it is as clear as the Sun at noon, that they ought to be referr'd to the Law and Testimony; for thus *I* read, *To the Law and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to This Word.* Having thus missed the sence of the Text, then in all that you say further, you discover a taunting spirit, endeavouring to bespatter me with what dirt comes next to hand.

I did not quote any one of the *five Texts*, as taking it singly to prove the whole Assertion; and therefore you did injure my understanding, to argue from them apart, as brought to prove the whole Position; but I brought them to prove such Propositions, as being laid together, do amount to so much as my Assertion (as I explicate it) doth contain. For the first *four Texts* do *all of them* shew, how God's People ought to try and defend themselves against such as oppose the Church and Truth of God, as I shewed in my *Rejoynder*: and the *fifth*, gives Reason her place in Religious Contests. But there is not one of the Arguments which I formed from my *five Quotations*, but you deprave and abuse it, by both adding terms of your own,

own, and omitting mine; yea, sometimes whole sentences: and when you have so done, you flout at the Conclusions. Which dealing is too bad for a sober Disputant,

It were a very easie thing to turn all your Objections here against the Scripture as insufficient to resolve differences in Religion, upon the Church as therefore insufficient to resolve them. For, whereas you say, That when both Parties pretend to have Scripture and Reason on their sides, then the Scripture cannot decide the Controversie; Might not I as well say, when both parties pretend to have the Church on their side (as that's the case between us) the Church then cannot decide our difference?

Again, where you seem to say, that when both parties contending, do say they hear the Apostles, that then the Apostles cannot (as they speak in the Scriptures) decide the Controversie: Hath not this the same force against the Church, when both parties contend they hear the Church? See how you can defend your self, and I doubt not but therein you will defend my Arguments for the Scripture.

And because you do cry up the Fathers, *&c.* for so clear a way to decide all our Controversies, I will therefore shew you, that they do clearly avouch the *Answer* which I have given to this your first *Query*, as will evidently appear to the impartial Reader of the several Quotations which I have before alledged, and which do here follow.

The ANSWER *to the* FIRST QUERY, *Avouched sufficient by the Sentence of divers* DOCTORS, *both Antient and Modern.*

WHether of us be Schismaticks? ask not me, I will not ask you. Let Christ be asked, that he may shew us his Church. *Aug. cont. Petil. c. 85*

Neither must I alledge the *Nicene* Council; nor you the *Arimi*. I am neither bound to the one, nor you to the other; let the matter be tryed by the Scripture. *Aug. cont. Max.*

Augustine saith, Let the Scriptures judge; let Christ judge; let the Apostles judge. Yea, it is confessed by the Papists, that *Optatus*, and *Basil*, summoned their Adversaries to the arbitriment of holy Scriptures, and did allow the sufficiency of holy Scripture to decide the Controversies depending between them. *Aug.* l. 3. c. 14 S. N. *Antidot.*

In

Chrysost. Hom. in Matth. In time past, saith *Chrysostome*, there were many wayes to know the Church of Christ (*viz.*) by good Life, by Miracles, by Chastity, *&c.* but from the time that *Heresies* did take hold of the Church, it *IS ONLY* known by the Scripture, which is the true Church.

Again, he saith, The Lord then knowing that so great confusion would come in the latter dayes, therefore willed the Christians that would take to the sureness of true Faith, to have refuge to nothing but to the Scripture; otherwise, saith he, if they regard other things they shall perish, not understanding what the true Church is.

[Thus my Answer, is avouched good, as it respects the means to decide the differences which are about the Church. Next, hear what they say touching such differences as are in the Church.]

Iren. l. 3 cap. 4. *Iren.* If there be any disagreement risen up among Christians concerning Controversies in Religion, what better course is there to be taken, than to have our recourse into the Most antient Churches, [which must needs be those planted by the Apostles, considering the time when he lived] and to receive from thence, what shall be certain and manifest.

Aug. 7. Tome cont. Eres. *Augustine.* Because the Scripture cannot deceive, whoso feareth to be misled in the obscurity of this Question, let him ask *COUNSEL* of that Church which the *SCRIPTURE*, without any ambiguity pointeth out.

Constantine Mag. There are the Gospel, the Prophets and Apostles, which do teach us what to hold in Religion; wherefore expelling all hostile and bitter contention, let us seek the Solution of these Questions out of the Scriptures. Thus spake this famous Emperor in the Council of *Nice*, at what time the Bishops had like to have jarred into pieces.

THus have I given an impartial Relation of what hath passed between the *Popish Querist* and my *Self*, in our *two last Papers*, (which contains the sum of what passed in the other) as touching this Question about the Judge of Controversies. And now, for further satisfaction, That the Scripture, as aforesaid, ought to be admitted the high Prerogative of Judge in our Debates; consider, that *of necessity it must be so.* My reason is, because either the Scripture, or some other Writings, must be our Judge, especially in this important Question, *WHICH IS THE TRUE CHURCH?* For when we contend about her, it is very unreasonable, that any party contending

contending for that title, ſhould be permitted to give Judgment in their own cauſe: As for example, The preſent Aſſembly of *Papiſts* ſay, *That they are the true Church:* and the preſent Aſſemblies of *Baptiſts* ſay, *That they are the true Church.* Is it fit that either party contending, ſhould here give Judgment deciſſive? What then muſt we do? why *of neceſſity* we muſt to ſome Writings, whereby to be decided or agreed in this Controverſie. Theſe Writings muſt be either the Scriptures, or ſome other; but no other can compare with thoſe, ſo that they do deſerve this Prerogative better than any other.

The *Papiſts* ordinary way in this difficulty, is to tell us, that we muſt here be tryed by the Tradition of our Fore-fathers; in which they ſay, *we cannot be deceived:* which Tradition, they ſay, is *the only thing that is unqueſtionable, and needs no other ground to ſtand upon, but it ſelf.* And againſt the Scripture's being received, upon its own evidence or authority, they uſually do thus object, *that before we can receive what it teacheth, we muſt be aſſured of its truth.* And again, they ſay, *the Scripture may not be the Judge of Controverſie, becauſe it may be corrupted, tranſlated, ill interpreted, not rightly underſtood.* And by theſe, and other like objections, they uſually in all their Writings, invalidate the Scriptures certainty, authority, and ſufficiency, that ſo they advance the authority of their Traditions. × might

Author 7. Qu. T. B. End to Contro.

But let it be ſeriouſly conſidered, whether theſe Objections have not the ſame force againſt what they reſt upon, which they have againſt the holy Scripture? Firſt then, whereas they tell us, *the Scripture cannot teach us any thing, till we be aſſured of its truth:* Doth not this conclude againſt any other thing as ſtrongly? Ought we not to be aſſured of the truth of the Church before we receive her documents? Ought we not to be aſſured of the truth of that Tradition which we receive for the Rule of our Faith? But how muſt we be aſſured of the truth of the Papal Church, and Tradition? There is not a man living, that can remember when either began, and ſo avouch its beginning to be of *divine Inſtitution*, and the continnance of the ſame ever ſince its beginning, to have been without any corruption: What then muſt we do? Why we muſt ſearch *Romes* Records. And then I ask, are they not as queſtionable, and liable to miſ-interpretations, as eaſily miſ-underſtood as the Records of God? What is now become of theſe Objections, the force whereof is evidently againſt the Papal Church and her Traditions, of the truth whereof we muſt be aſſured BEFORE we can be taught by either of them.

I ſay

I ſay again, There is not a man of all the *Papiſts* that can evidence *Rome* to have been a Church two hundred years ago, and then much leſs one thouſand ſix hundred years ago. So that *OF NECESSITY* we muſt to the Writings of ſome men (whom we never ſaw write one word) to find the Church. And then *I* would know why we may not make enquiry at the Pen of *Paul*, what the Church was at firſt, and what it ought to be now, as well as at the Pen of *Auguſtine*. Cannot the Pen of *Peter* the Apoſtle give us as good information in this matter, as the Pen of any *Pope*, pretending to be his Succeſſor? If the *Papiſts* anſwer, That we know not the Pen of *Peter* or *Paul*: We anſwer, as well as they know the Pen of *Auguſtine* or *Gregory*. If they ſay *Paul's* Writings may be corrupted, and muſt be interpreted, may be miſ-underſtood. *I* return the ſame Anſwer of all other Books whatſoever; yea, thoſe which contains *Romes* Tradition. See therefore what is gained by deviſiug objections againſt the authority or certainty of the holy Scriptures. Such doings do only tend to the deſtruction of all Faith, making every thing doubtful, and the effect is the uſhering in of all uncleanneſs on the one hand, or if men miſs this ſnare, they are catched in another, *viz.* to walk at random as their own, or other mens fancy leads them. This is evident by what we have ſeen in the *Ranters* on the one hand, and the *Papiſts* and *Quakers* on the other.

Let us trace this matter a little further, thus. The *Papiſts* Traditions (moſt, if not all of which, have been committed to Writing ſeveral hundreds of years ago) muſt ſpeak for themſelves, are unqueſtionable of themſelves, muſt challenge no ground but themſelves to ſtand upon: But the ſacred Scripture which hath eſpecial Promiſe from God for its preſervation, *Pſal.* 12. muſt have none of theſe high priviledges allowed it; Is not this a moſt peccant Aſſertion? Again, *Peter* and *Paul* muſt be no Judges of Controverſies in Religion, as they ſpeak to us in their Epiſtles; but the *Popes* of *Rome*, dead long ago, and now only ſpeak in their Writings, yet they muſt be our infallible Judges in theſe Controverſies. The great Council of Apoſtles, Elders, and Brethren, *Acts* 15. can be no Judge of any Controverſie, though their Decrees are yet extant among us; but the Council of *Trent*, who only ſpeak in their Decrees, muſt be our Judge, and that *ſo* as from their Judgments no appeal can be admitted. The Apoſtolical Council ſends forth their Decrees in the Name of the holy Ghoſt, and themſelves; and in thoſe their Decrees, they prohibit the eating of blood, and ſtrangled things, *&c.* But the Papal Councils will ſend forth a Decree directly

oppoſite

oppoſite to this, and yet ſign'd with theſe powerful words; *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis.* If we appeal in this matter to the Apoſtolical Council, they may not be permitted to pronounce a Sentence deciſſive. But *from* the ſentence of the Papal Council we muſt in no wiſe appeal. Can any thing be ſaid more unworthily?

Thus then, Firſt, the godly Reader may perceive, That whether he be able to anſwer all the cunning Objections that men, by reaſon of the long experience they have had in the wayes of deceit, have found out; yet he hath an Argument of *NECESSITY* wherewith to oppoſe their ſubtilty. And, Secondly, he hath the advantage of all their own objections, againſt themſelves; yea, againſt their Church, Tradition, and all that they ſtand upon. Being ſeaſonably retorted upon them. Wherefore I ſhall conclude with the *Pſalmiſt's* words, *Pſal.* 64. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

They encourage themſelves in an evil matter: they commune of laying ſnares privily; they ſay, Who ſhall ſee them?

They ſearch out iniquities, they accompliſh a diligent ſearch: both the inward thoughts of every one of them, and the heart is deep.

But God ſhall ſhoot at them with an arrow, ſuddenly ſhall they be wounded.

So they ſhall make their own tongues to fall upon themſelves: all that ſee them, ſhall flee away.

And all men ſhall fear, and ſhall declare the work of God: for they ſhall wiſely conſider of his doings.

THE SECOND PART, SHEWETH,

That the preſent Papal Church *of* Rome, *is not the* Church *of* Chriſt, *for divers important Cauſes or Reaſons.*

WE have heard of how dangerous a Conſequence that Papal Opinion is, which leads them to ſet up their own Authority (under pretence of their being the Church) above the holy Scripture; inſomuch as they allow it no Authority, till it be delivered to us for God's Word, by their Church; ſo that by this Doctrine, we muſt find their Church, before we can find the Word of God, as it is contained in the Scripture.

Upon which Conſideration, we ſhall endeavour to ſhew, That the preſent Papal Church, is not the true Church of Chriſt; and therefore what Power ſoever the Church hath, yet they cannot have it; Becauſe they are not the Church of Chriſt.

The Firſt Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, cannot poſſibly prove her ſelf to be the Church of Chriſt: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Firſt Reaſon maintained.

THe Conſequence of the Argument no underſtanding man can deny; for unleſs a party pretending to be the Church of Chriſt, can ſome wayes ſufficiently prove that they are his Church, they cannot reaſonably blame any body that refuſes ſo to account of them. And for the Antecedent, namely, that it is impoſſible for the preſent Papal

Papal Church to prove her ſelf the Church of Chriſt, it is evident from this ground, *viz.* They make both the Scripture, and all other Writings, depend on their Church for their Authority; and therefore they muſt prove themſelves to be the Church without the help of any authentical or authoritative Writings; which thing is impoſſible for them to do.

Being thus diveſted of the help of all Records, as is more fully ſhewed above, there remains now nothing for them to lean upon but their own Evidence, or the Tradition of their Fore-fathers; not that which is contained in any Records, but only that which hath been delivered by word from man to man, *&c.* But alas! what Tradition is this they ſpeak of? Not the Tradition of the Church to us, till the perſons delivering the ſame, be found to be the Church; which, as before, they cannot be found to be, without the Scripture. And for their own Evidence, that may not prove them to be the Church to thoſe that contend with them; it cannot avail them, ſith each party contending in this caſe, will, and may, as reaſonably as the *Papiſts*, look that their own Teſtimony ſhould be as available for theſe, as the other for thoſe.

It is as vain here to tell us, they are the Church, becauſe the true marks of the Church do agree to the Papal Church, and none elſe. For, firſt, the true marks of the Church are confeſſed by the *Papiſts*, to be found in the Scripture; which Scripture they receive not, but from the authority of their Church (*yea, their preſent Church*) ſo that till the Scripture can tell us authoritatively which be the marks of the Church, no Church can be found by thoſe marks; nor can the Scripture tell us of thoſe marks authoritatively, till *Rome*, as a Church, give it us for God's Word: So then *Rome* muſt be found the Church, before there be any marks to find her by; which is impoſſible. *Author of the 7. Queries*

As for example: To clear this matter further, the *Papiſts* ſay, *That Holineſs is a mark of the true Church:* But now ſet the Holy Scripture aſide, and how ſhall I know *holineſs* from *unholineſs*, without the Scripture? Here the *Papiſts* being in a ſtrait, rather than they will let the Law of God, or the Scripture, have the preheminence, do Anſwer thus; That *we have a Law in our Conſciences, which dictates what is good, and what is otherwiſe; and by this Law, even a Heathen may judge our Church holier than any other Congregations of Chriſtians.* *Author of the 7. Queries*

What a miſerable plunge (of *Heatheniſm* or *Quakeriſm*) are they brought to here? How do they know that a *Heathen* may, by the

Law of Conſcience, judge their Church to be more holy than ANY other Congregation of Chriſtians? Were they ever *Heathens* to know this? But alas! what holineſs can a *Heathen* judge of? Surely not that which is an infallible mark of the true Church; for this Spiritual matter is fooliſhneſs to the Natural man, nor can he know it, becauſe 'tis ſpiritually diſcerned. It is true, there is *a Holineſs* diſcernable by the Law of our Conſciences. But this only, is not an infallible mark, that any Society is the Church of Chriſt; nor did ever any man (I am perſwaded) hold forth ſuch a Doctrine, that was a faithful Miniſter of the New Teſtament, or Spirit.

Again, What of this kind of *Holineſs*, whereof a *Heathen* (as ſuch) can judge, is there found among the *Papiſts*, which may not be found among the *Baptiſts*? yea, among thoſe that are oppoſite to both, as the *Quakers*, and others; yea, among the very *Jews* and *Turks* may be found as much of this kind of *Holineſs* as among the *Papiſts*, if any credit may be given to Hiſtories.

Sometimes the *Papiſts* do object the *Creed* as ſufficient, to demonſtrate a man to be a Member of the Church, though he know not whether there be any Scripture. But I Anſwer, How ſhall this be proved to be the *Creed*? it muſt not be its own evidence; for then the Scripture may as well ſpeak for it ſelf, which the *Papiſts* will not allow; nor can the Church of *Rome* confer any authority upon the *Creed*, till they be found to be the Church: So then this is the Concluſion, *Rome* muſt be found to be the Church, before there be a *Creed*.

* *It would be here noted, That neither the marks of* Unity, Univerſalilty, &c. *nor the* Creed, *do prove a People that hath them all, to be the Church; becauſe none of them mention* Baptiſm, *without which there cannot be a viſible Church.*

I do therefore humbly deſire theſe few Obſervations may be ſeriouſly thought upon by all ſober men, but eſpecially the *Papiſts*, that ſo men may give to the holy Scriptures, that which is proper to them; that is, That they may ſpeak, without controul, both for themſelves, and every thing elſe of a Religious conſideration; or elſe all Volumns of the Antients, and Societies of men, pretending to Chriſtianity (as things ſtand in our dayes) muſt depart into utter ſilence.

The Second Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, hath no Baptiſm: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Second Reaſon maintained.

BY the word *Baptiſm* in the Argument, I mean only the *Baptiſm of Water in the Name of the Father, &c.* or, which is all one, the *Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of ſins*. Now that the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* hath not this Baptiſm, is evident by this Argument, taken from their own Confeſſion, *viz.*

The Baptiſm of the true Church is found in the Scripture. But the Baptiſm of the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* is not grounded upon, nor mentioned in the Scripture. Therefore the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* hath no Baptiſm.

The firſt Propoſition is moſt clear, from *Matth.*28. 19,20. *Act.*2. *Act.* 8. *Act.* 9. *Act.* 16. *Act.* 18. *Act.* 19. *Act.* 22. 16. *Rom.* 6. *Gal.* 3. 27. *Col.*2.11, 12. *Heb.*6. 1, 2. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.

And, that the Papiſts Baptiſm is not found in the Scripture, I prove thus. Becauſe they themſelves do confeſs, that Infant Baptiſm is not mentioned in the Scripture, nor grounded upon the Scripture, nor any Scripture for it. See to this purpoſe, the Works of *Bellarmine*; and a Book, entituled, *An Antidote*, written by *S. N.* a Popiſh Doctor; as alſo *T. B.* his *End to Controverſie*. In which Books you will find the very words which I have repeated. Adde hereunto the Anſwer which I received from the Author of the *Seven Queries*, when *I* asked him what Controverſies in Religion he could reſolve without the written Word of God? he aſſigned *Infant Baptiſm*, as one that was ſo to be reſolved.

So then, we have it *pro confeſſo* from the Papiſts own mouths, That their Baptiſm (which is *Infant Baptiſm*) is a *Scriptureleſs-Baptiſm*: Therefore ſay I, it is no Baptiſm.

No Baptiſm, I ſay; becauſe the Church hath but one Baptiſm of Water, and it is mentioned in the Scripture, and grounded upon it, and much Scripture found for it; ſo is not *Infant Baptiſm*, which is the Baptiſm of the preſent Papal Church. Therefore the Papal Baptiſm, is no Baptiſm. How can they defend themſelves? Will they ſay, the Church hath a Scripture-Baptiſm, and an unwritten Baptiſm? This they muſt ſay and prove, or elſe deny their *Infant Baptiſm*.

But

But, ſecondly, The preſent Papal Church is ſo adulterated in the manner of the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, as that, had they a true ſubject for Baptiſm, yet, they would be found to have no Baptiſm. This will appear as clear as the Light, from the Papiſts own confeſſion; for they grant, *that the antient and primitive way of baptizing, was, by dipping the party baptized, over the head and ears in Water; and that it was their Church which changed this way, to a little ſprinkling upon the forehead.* This is plainly to be ſeen in a Book, entituled, *Certamen Religioſum.*

This bold Change, which men, without any allowance from God, have made in this Miniſtration of Baptiſm, is directly againſt the Scripture. *Mat.* 3. 16. *Mark* 15. 9. *John* 3. 23. *Act.* 8. 38, 39. *Rom.* 6. In all which places it's evident, that our Lord Jeſus, *John Baptiſt*, and the other *Baptiſts* of thoſe times, did ſo underſtand the mind of God in reſpect of the manner of the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, as that they thought it could not be done without ſo much Water as they might go into (both the Perſon baptizing, and the Perſon to be baptized) And now, do not all that will preſume to ſatisfie themſelves in this thing with a few drops of Water put on the face only, from a Man's fingers ends, or out of a Glaſs in the Midwifes pocket, lay great folly and ignorance to the charge of Chriſt and his primitive followers? doubtleſs ſuch, as is not leſs than the folly of that man, that hath occaſion only for one Gill of Water, and he may take it up at the ſide of the Brook, and yet will needs wade into the middle of a River to take it up; or a man that hath occaſion to waſh his hands only, which he may perform very commodiouſly without wetting his foot, and yet is ſo ſimple that he will needs go into the middle of the River to that purpoſe, eſpecially ſuch a River where there is much Water. I ſay, the practice of Sprinkling which the Papiſts and others uſe, if that anſwer the mind of God in the caſe of Baptiſm, doth even thus reflect upon Chriſt and the Chriſtians in thoſe dayes. But let our Saviours practice herein be juſtified, and all ſuch practices as tend to the rendring it ridiculous, condemned.

The Papiſts only Reſerve for the defence of *Infant Baptiſm*, is this: They ſay it is an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, that is, a Precept delivered by the Apoſtles Word, but not mentioned in their Writings.

This I ſhall ſhew to be utterly falſe, for divers important Reaſons. Firſt, No Apoſtolical Tradition, tends to the making null or void any Apoſtolical Writing. But Infant Sprinkling makes null and void all that is written in the Scriptures, concerning the ſubject and manner

ner of Baptism, in all that part of the World where the Papists (or such as they) get the Civil Power on their side: yea, we see that by this means the sons of men are great enemies to the way of God in this matter. How long have many Nations lain destitute of the knowledge of the *Baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins*, by reason of the interposition of this cloudy Tradition of *Pedo-Rantism*? How have men, pretending to be Ministers of Christ, never, in many Generations, preached *Peter's* Doctrine, *Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, for the Remission of sins*? Note this Observation well; for although the Baptism of Repentance, *&c.* hath not been cryed down in the Nations of Christendom, (by such as counted themselves the only Preachers of the Gospel) yet it was not for that these Nations had no need of the practice of Baptism; for they daily have practised something under that notion, which is their Infant-sprinkling; So that it's plain, Infant-Baptism makes void the Apostolical Writings: Therefore Infant-Baptism is no Apostolical Tradition.

Secondly, Infant-Baptism is not an Apostolical Tradition, because no mention is made of it in the first hundred of years after Christ. Although I am not much read, yet I have used the utmost of my diligence to know the Truth in this Point, and I have attained to sufficient satisfaction, that the greatest favourer of Infant-Baptism that yet I have met with, durst not say that ever he saw any Record of Antiquity that mentioned such a thing, and that the Scriptures do not mention it, the Papists grant.

And because the Papists make such boast of the consent which they ce in this matter from Antiquity, I will therefore here put in thing by way of Evidence to the contrary. For it is certain that Baptism, as it was not heard of in the first hundred, so neis it generally received till above half a thousand years revoln Christ, as is undeniable; for that it is plain, that famous (or at least, very famous) Christian Parents up their Children without having them baptized; he Parents of *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, *Au*others; yea, the Emperour *Constantius*, born of rents, was not baptized till he was about age*. See also these ensuing Testimonies.

unto you, how we offer up our selves unto God in hat we are renewed through Christ, such as are h, and believe that which we teach them, being he same; we admonish to fast and pray, and em; then they are brought to the Water, and

**See a Book, entituled, A well-grounded Treatise concerning Baptism.*

Justin Mart. in orat. ad Antho. pium.

and there calling on the Name of the Father, *&c.* they are waſhed *in it.* So ſaith *Eraſmus, paraphraſe* on *Matth.*28. *If they believe that which you teach them, and begin to be repentant of their former life, then dip them* In Water, *In the Name, &c.*

*Jerom. ſuper Mat.*28 The Lord commanded his Apoſtles, that they ſhould firſt inſtruct all Nations, and afterward *baptiſe* thoſe that were inſtructed: for it cannot be that the body ſhould receive the Sacrament of Baptiſm, unleſs the ſoul have received *before* the true Faith.

Athan. in ſerm. 3. *cont. Arrian.* Our Saviour did not ſlightly command to baptize, but firſt of all he ſaid, *teach*, and then *baptize*, that true Faith might come by *teaching*, and Baptiſm be perfected by *Faith.*

Haimo ſaith, *In this place* (Matth. 28.) *is ſet down a Rule rightly how to baptize*, that is, *that Teaching ſhould go before Baptiſm: for*, he ſaith, *Teach all Nations*, (and then he ſaith) *and baptize them: for, he that is to be baptized, muſt be before inſtructed, that he firſt learn to believe, that which in Baptiſm he ſhall receive: For, as Faith without Works is dead; ſo Works, if they have no Faith, are nothing worth.*

Haimo. in poſtil. ſup. text

Beda *ſuper Act.*19. *Beda* ſaith, *All they that came to the Apoſtles to be baptized, were inſtructed of them, and when they were inſtructed concerning the Sacrament of Baptiſm, they received the holy adminiſtration thereof.*

Tertul. *qui ſunt Bapt. parvil.* *Tertullian*, who lived about the time when Infant-Baptiſm began to appear, did diſpute againſt it, as an unneceſſary practice, for divers cauſes. 1. *For that it is not meet to commit heavenly things, to thoſe who are not capable of keeping treaſure of an earthly nature.* 2. *For th the Sponſors might be endangered.* 3. *For that it became them were to be baptized, to faſt, pray, and confeſs their ſins.* 4. *Be they that receive Chriſt, muſt ask him; let them* (that is, little come therefore, ſaith he, *while they are youths, whilſt wherein th they are taught, &c.*

Auguſtine ſaith, *We ſpend much time in exhorting thoſe whom tize*—— *Ludovicus vives*, commenting upon this place, ſ *any man ſhould miſtake this place of* Auguſtine, *let him know time it was the cuſtom to baptize NONE, except they were and did deſire Baptiſm in their own perſons, and that ſever did underſtand what that Myſtical Water meant, which w in our baptizing of Infants.*

Aug. de Civitat. Dei.

[Lo here your Pedo-baptiſm is not the old cu

The Third Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, is a National Church: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The third Reaſon maintained.

1. TO make the Goſpel-Church National, conſequently deſtroyes the Doctrin of Converſion, as it is a principle of the Doctrin of Chriſt appertaining to the beginning of a Chriſtian man: For, if men can regenerate, or beget perſons to God in their infancy, then the Word of Regeneration or new-birth is needleſs in order to our admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt, and ſo the preaching of Faith and Repentance muſt ceaſe (*as it is a Principle pertaining to a Chriſtian man*) in all thoſe Nations which are called *Chriſtendom*, which is a great part of the World. And indeed, Experience hath long ago proved this Concluſion to be moſt true; for ſince the Church (as they term it) was National, the Word, or Work of Converſion, hath been little known in the life and power of it: nay, verily, the very term [*Converſion*] is become a reproach among our National-Church-members. But thus to make the Word of Converſion unneceſſary, in order to perſons admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt, is contrary to the Scripture, *John* 3. 5. *Luke* 24. 47. *Matth.* 20. 19. 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17. *Heb.* 8. 10, 11. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28. *Matth.* 3. 8, 9, 10.

2. To make the Goſpel-Church National, puts an end to the Doctrine of Chriſt touching that Separation, and thoſe Diviſions, which for the Goſpel-ſake *muſt be in Nations and Families*, as appears from theſe Scriptures; *John* 15. 19. and 17. 14, 16. *Acts* 2. 40, 47. 1 *Cor.* 6. *Luke* 12. 49, to 54. And therefore in vain doth any perſon think to do God ſervice, by compelling Families, Towns, Countries, Nations, or many Nations, to be of one mind in matters of Religion. I ſay, it is in vain, becauſe the Scripture foreſees, and alſo foreſhews, that the contrary effects muſt follow the preaching of the Goſpel; and yet they may, yea, and ought to live in one form of Civil Government: for that is the will of God concerning *every ſoul*, *Rom.* 13. 1, to 8.

3. The Goſpel-Church cannot be National; becauſe that takes away from her, Perſecution for the Goſpel-ſake, & makes her become a Perſecutor: For it is impoſſible for a Church to be National without penal Laws, whereby to force men to that kind of Worſhip which

the greater part approveth, which may as poſſibly be falſe as true. But the true Church muſt not look to be free from Perſecution, if ſhe † 2 *Cor.* 5.20. live godly in *Chriſt Jeſus*; nor is any thing more † *uncomly* for her than to puniſh or perſecute men into a Conformity to her Faith or religious practice, *John* 15. 19, 20. *Mat.* 10. 22. 2 *Tim.* 3. 12. *Luke* 9. 56. And the greateſt part of the *Revelations* do ſhew, that the Church was to be in a ſuffering condition, and are therefore bid to *be patient, until the coming of the Lord*, Jam. 5.

4. A National-Church cannot obſerve the diſcipline of the Church of Chriſt; for, in the caſe of withdrawing from diſorderly perſons, they do not only ſeparate men of diſorder from the Church, both in Civil and Religious concerns, but they caſt them wholly out of the World, from all Markets and Fairs, yea, quite out of their Livelihoods, *&c.* which kind of Excommunication the Scripture foreſees to be proper to the Churches Adverſary, *Rev.* 13. 16, 17.

5. If the Goſpel-Church ought to be National, then ſhe was imperfect in point of Power in the Apoſtles dayes: for ſhe had not then any Power to put Hereticks to death for their Hereſie. But to ſay, that the Primitive Church wanted any Power to puniſh any ſin, as it concerns the Church to puniſh it, is to diſparage the Apoſtolical Churches, and is alſo contrary to the Scriptures, which plainly ſhew they had Power then to revenge all diſobedience, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5, 6.

The Fourth Reaſon.

The Papal Church encreaſeth her ſelf more by the Carnal Sword, than by the Spiritual Word: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The fourth Reaſon maintained.

THat ſuch Churches as are National, do moſt encreaſe their numbers, and keep them alſo when they have them, by the terror of Death and Penal Laws, both Experience ſhews, and Reaſon tels that it cannot be otherwiſe. How often hath our Nation changed their Religion, with the breath of a Prince? ſometime to *Popery*, and otherwhiles to *Proteſtancy*, and under *O. Cromwel* to a compound of half *Presbytery* and half *Independency*, according to the temper of thoſe that ſat at the Stern of Affairs? And now, how are they turn'd again to *Prelacy*? Of which laſt change, I ſay, if any have conformed, as judging

judging it their duty to God ſo to do, thoſe (though this doth not juſtifie their way to be good, yet) are honeſt men: But if any for ſelf-intereſt have done it, they are the very dregs of men, and will be any thing, and ſo nothing.

2. I remember a notable ſaying of *Hillary*, who lived about the 4th or 5th hundred, and in his dayes the Church was a degenerating from her Regeneral Conſtitution into a National Form, where he ſaith, *Ambition doth aid it ſelf by the Name of CHRIST; the Church doth fear and compel the People through Baniſhments and Impriſonment, to believe her in thoſe things, which ſhe had received through being impriſoned — She that could not be beloved of Chriſt if the World had not hated her, now glorieth to be extolled and beloved of the World, &c.* *Hillar. contra Auxen.*

And that the Papal Church hath ordinarily encreaſed her ſelf more by terror of the Carnal Sword than the Word of God, doleful Hiſtories do declare; namely theſe, *Sleidan Comment.* A Book entituled, *The Indians Tears*, or, *Inquiſition for Blood:* as alſo, *Fox his Acts and Monuments.*

And here I think it meet to give an inſtance from one of their own Hiſtoriagraphers, namely *Fabinus.* He tells us that after *Auſtin* the Monk had gotten a conſiderable ſettlement in *England*, it happened that there was a Council aſſembled in this Nation, where *Auſtin* propoſed ſeveral things, to which the other Biſhops could not conſent; but, by your leave, when *Auſtin* could not prevail by the Word (or rather, his words) he told them, *If they would not ſubmit, they ſhould be compelled, by the waſting that ſhould be made in their Country through War and Miſery.* This was not *Paul*'s way, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20.

The Fifth Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, labours to keep the World in darkneſs, and the Church alſo: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The fifth Reaſon maintained.

THe Conſequence of this Argument no man can deny; for there is nothing more oppoſit to the true Church, than to love, or cauſe darkneſs to ſeize upon any. And that the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* labours to keep all men in darkneſs, is thus proved. 1. She forbids almoſt all men to reade the Scriptures, and thereupon hath

greatly withſtood the Tranſlation of them into every Tongue, as is evident, partly from what Hiſtory declares, and partly from that which themſelves do ſay. To omit Hiſtory, hear what they ſay themſelves. In their Preface to the Reader in the *Rhemiſt Teſtament*, thus they ſpeak:

Order was taken by the Deputies of the late famous Council of Trent *in this behalf, and confirmed by ſupream Authority, That the Scripture, though truly tranſlated into the vulgar Tongues, yet may not be indifferently read of all men, nor of any other than ſuch as have expreſs Order thereunto of their lawful Ordinaries.* So that we ſee the Liberty here given, is unlike the Liberty given by Chriſt to his enemies, whom he commanded to ſearch the Scripture, *John* 5. 39. And the rich Glutton's Friends are ſaid to have the *Prophets* and *Moſes*, Luk. 16. 29. *Iſrael* was of old indifinitly required to lay up the Book of the Law in their heart; to talk of it as they ſate in their houſes; as they went abroad; they muſt teach them to their children, and write them upon the poſts of their doors, *Deut.* 6. 4, to 9.

Notwithſtanding all this and much more liberty given by the Lord both to his Enemies and Friends, to reade his Word, you ſee the *Council of Trent* will have none permitted, but whom the Ordinaries permit, to reade the Scripture, and they are only ſuch as they judge diſcreet, &c. *Pref. Rhem. Teſt.*

Is it not ſtrange that men, pretending to be Chriſt's true Followers, ſhould thus contradict him? He allowed that to his Enemies, which they will not allow to his Friends. Sure they have neither heard his Voice, nor ſeen his Shape, or, at leaſt, not learned of him. Miſerable is the Goſpel-Church by the Council of *Trents* Doctrine, they have not that priviledge which *Iſrael* under the Law was allowed; and yet they are as ſtrictly bound *to bring up their Children in the admonition of the Lord*; which they cannot do, unleſs they have the Law in their heart, that ſo they may talk of it to their Children. But ſurely, thoſe that will not let the Law come within the ſight of our eyes, have no mind it ſhould ever come in our hearts: So then they labour to keep us in the dark.

What can they ſay againſt mens reading the Scripture, which hath not the ſame force againſt the hearing of it preached? Did not ſome conceive as groſs opinions concerning Chriſt's ſaying, men muſt eat his fleſh, as ſome have by reading them? The *Jews* thought they were ſo to be underſtood, as that they might eat his *real fleſh*; and that was not a greater nor a leſſe Error, than is found in the *Papiſts*, who read the ſame word. It is doubtleſs a ſhrewd ſign that thoſe who

who will not ſuffer us to *ſee* the Law of God, do not intend that we ſhall *hear* very much of it; peradventure ſuch Points as talk of Tythes, *&c.*

Yea, it is evident, that they intend not to let us hear much that ſhall profit us; for they have deviſed, that the very Prayers and Services of their Church, be ſaid and ſung in a tongue which the People underſtand not. Yea, they tell us, *That it is enough for the People to underſtand that the Prayer is made to call upon God in all our deſires; and more than this is not neceſſary (they ſay:)* So that the poor People in the Papacy, know not what are the things deſired; only they are told, The Prayer is made to God in all that is therein deſired. Are not theſe People kept in darkneſs? But ſaith *Paul, How ſhould the unlearned ſay*, Amen? 1 *Cor.* 14.

That which is moſt ſtrange, is, That the Papiſts ſhould deliver this dark Doctrine, from 1 *Cor.* 14. then which no Scripture more requireth an underſtanding in thoſe that pray, and in thoſe that joyn with them; nor doth any Scripture more clearly ſhew us, to how little purpoſe it is to perform any Service in the Church in an unknown tongue. Read the Chapter; ſaith *Paul, If I come unto you ſpeaking with tongues, what ſhall I profit you?* —— but *in the Church I will ſpeak five words with my underſtanding, that I may inſtruct others alſo, rather than ten thouſand words in an unknown tongue.* Theſe are *Paul's* words, as the Papiſts themſelves tranſlate them.

Another way whereby they keep men in darkneſs is this, They cumber mens minds with ſuch a MULTITUDE of Ceremonies, and Repetitions in their Prayers, that the mind is ſufficiently charged to remember how many times over they muſt ſay ſome two or three words; nay, it's evident this is no wrong, witneſs their Beads which ſerve to ſupply the defect of their memories. As I remember, there is not leſs than fifty Orations and Poſtulations, *&c.* which the Prieſt is to make, and act, before the Bread be Conſecrated when they ſay Maſs; and the like doings they have in the moſt of their Services, which I can more deſire the Lord would deliver them from, than mention. *Willit. Synopſ.*

The Sixth Reason.

The present Papal Church, is generally (if not only at this day) gathered of persons unregenerate, or not new born, as the Scriptures do require new-birth in that case: Therefore she is not the Church of Christ.

The Sixth Reason maintained.

1. THe Scripture saith, That *except a man* (or any one) *be born again* (SO) as to be like the winde *THAT BLOWETH*, and that bloweth in such sort, as the sound thereof *IS HEARD*, *he cannot enter into the Kingdom* (or Church) *of God*: But the many millions of Infants, whereof the Papal Church consists mostly (if not only) in respect of her Members Initiation, are not thus regenerate. So that the Papal Church is gathered (generally) of such Persons as are not so regenerate, as Persons oughtto be, and must of necessity be, before they be admitted into the Church of Christ. The Seed of the Woman (or Gospel-Church) are all such as have the Faith of Jesus, and keep the Commandments of God, at least in Profession; for that is the thing that is absolutely necessary, in order to any Person's admission into the Church of Christ, *John* 3. 5, 6. 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17. *Rev.* 12. *ult.* *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28.

2. All the Children of the new Covenant, or Church of Christ, do *DIFFER* from the Church under *Moses*, *SO*, as that they, each individual, do so know the Lord, as that they need not, in some sort, teach *one another*, saying, *Know the Lord*, Heb. 8. Jer. 31. But either all, or the generality of the Papal Church, differ nothing from the Church under *Moses*, in respect of their *KNOWLEDGE*, when admitted into their Church, Being such as are not capable of the first, or least degree of the knowledge of him.

3. There appears no more sign of Regeneration, or new-Birth, in the Infants, or Members of the Papal Church, at their admission, than there appears in such as the Papists say are not regenerate. Now where the Spirit of regeneration is, it is not without some demonstrable operation; for saith Christ, *The wind bloweth*, &c. *and thou heareſt the sound thereof*, &c. *SO IS EVERY* One that is born of the Spirit. So that I conclude, That the Infants whom the Papists say they baptize, are not born of the Spirit, unless they can give some demonstrative sign of it.

4. There

4. There can be no Regeneration in an ordinary way, without preaching the Doctrine of Chriſt, *Rom.* 10. But the Papal Church is generally (if not only) gathered without the Word preached, in order to the regeneration of the Members, before their admiſſion. Therefore they are not regenerate in an ordinary way. And if they have an extraordinary regeneration, let them ſhew it.

The Seventh Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, maintaineth the Doctrine of Devils, and that ſo violently, as that they puniſh the Non-obſervation thereof with Excommunication and Death: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

This Argument maintained.

THis Reaſon, or Argument, may ſeem to be harſhly laid down; yet if it be true, there is neceſſity to propound it. And for the truth of it, I deſire you weigh what followeth.

1. To forbid Marriage, and to command to abſtain from Meats which God hath created to be received, of ſuch as believe and obey the Truth; this is the doctrine of Devils. But it is well known that the Papiſts do forbid the whole Calling of their Clergy to Marry, and thouſands beſide of thoſe that live in their Monaſteries and Nunries, *&c.* and this under pain of *Curſing* and *Death*. You ſhall hear them ſpeak their own words, wherein they do not only prohibit Marriage for ever to ſuch as enter into the Miniſtry; but if any be married, and afterwards come into the Miniſtry, they wholly deprive ſuch of the enjoyment of their Yoke-fellows. Thus they ſpeak; *The cauſe why the Church requireth chaſtity in the Clergie, and forbiddeth not only fornication, but all carnal copulation, even in lawful wedlock, is to the end, that God's Prieſts be not divided from him by the clogs of Marriage, but be clean and pure from all the fleſhly acts of copulation:* And this doctrine they teach from 1 *Cor.* 7. where if you reade the 4, 5, 6, 7. *verſes*, you may eaſily learn the quite contrary Doctrine. Again, They teach from 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. *That none ſhall Marry that come into holy Orders.* And, *that if any of the Clergie, in other Countries, had been permitted, in times paſt, to enjoy their Wives, yet they now declare it to be againſt the Apoſtles Rule: And this they ſay is the Sentence of the Council of* Nice. But ſurely *Paul's* words are clear contrary; *Rhem. Teſt. Annot.* *Rhem. Teſt. Annot.*

contrary; for he ſaith, *A Biſhop muſt be the Husband of one Wife, having his Children in ſubjection*, &c.

In further proof of this matter, it is upon Record, That *Greg.7. An.* 1070. did enforce Miniſters by Excommunication, to leave their *Diſt.* 32 *cap.* 10. Wives. And *Urban* 2. *Anno.* 1066. Decreed, That it might be lawful to make the Miniſters Wives bond-women. And *Fox* recordeth, That it was made Felony, by the Act of the *Six Articles*, for Miniſters to marry Wives, *Fox, p.*1135. And this cruelty *Bellarmine* defends by a ſaying of *Jerome*, That a Biſhop begetting Children, ſhall be condemned as an Adulterer.

Now whereas I ſay they forbid Meats, *&c.* I do not mean, that it is not meet for the Church to Faſt and Pray, and in ſuch a ſenſe to forbid meat. But for their Church to forbid one kind of meat above another; as that we may not eat Eggs in Lent, and divers other creatures which God hath created, to be received of ſuch as believe. For the true way of Faſting, is a total faſting for the time (unleſs neceſſity deny.) And truly the Papal Faſt of Lent is in a manner no Faſt, which allows the drinking of Wines, and the eating to the full of ſuch delicacies as do inflame the fleſh as much as Eggs, *&c.* which yet the Papiſts by no means will permit men to eat. For my Author tells me, That they make the eating of Eggs in Lent, a damnable ſin. *Fox, p.*1043. I might fill much Paper about their forbidding meats. But to proceed:

The Eighth Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, is Myſtery Babylon: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Eighth Reaſon maintained.

1. I Know, that generally all that diſſent from *Rome*, do account her as in her preſent ſtate to be *Myſtery Babylon*; And truly for my part, I have conſidered of this matter, and I find it is ſo clearly meant of *Rome*, that even the Papiſts do not wholly exempt her from this Name. Yet they deny that *Rome*, as now conſidered, is *Myſtery Babylon*; only, ſay they, it is to be referred to *Rome* in her *Heatheniſh* eſtate. But thus I reaſon;

2. If the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* be not *Myſtery Babylon*, then either the Papiſts, or ſome body elſe, can ſhew us a People which better deſerves that title. But this no man can do (ſo far as yet I have learned) and therefore (as yet) I muſt ſay,

The

The present Papal Church of *Rome* (together with her Daughter Churches) is *Mystery Babylon*. And for further proof in this Point, I thus reason:

3. The present Papal Church hath the Marks of *Mystery Babylon*; therefore she is *Mystery Babylon*.

I prove it thus:

One Mark of *Mystery Babylon*, is a Regiment over the Kings of the Earth, *Rev.* 17. *The Woman which thou sawest, is that great City which reigneth over the Kings of the Earth.* This Mark the present Papal Church of *Rome* hath above all other; Witness the Papists own Books, *T. B. End to Controv. chap.* 26, 27. where he sets up the Pope above all Kings and Emperors; and plainly calls the Popes, Kings and Monarchs; and the Papal Church, he terms an invincible Empress, *&c.*

Another Mark of *Mystery Babylon*, is great Riches and wordly Pomp. That *Rome*, in her present Church-state, hath this Mark, her Doctor, *T. B.* is my witness. So is *Helen. Geog. p.* 192, 193. and *Napier, Rev.* 9. which Authors shew her Riches (even of the Clergy only) to be quite out of the reach of the best Arithmaticks to pass an *Entrado* upon it. Add to all other witnesses that of *Expeperience*, and it will shew us, That when their Church had her domination in this Land, they knew where the best Ground lay; as the Ruins of their Abbeys do evince. Compare all these with *Rev.* 18. and see if they do not agree.

Another Mark of *Mystery Babylon* is, She sits upon Nations, Tongues, and Peoples. *Rome* hath this Mark; *T. B.* in his *End to Controversies, chap.* 26, 27.

Another Mark of *Mystery Babylon* is, She enslaves the Souls of men, and is drunk with blood. Now that the Papal Church of *Rome* hath this Mark, I need only to refer my Readers to those large Histories of *Sleidan*, *Fox*, and *Benzo* the *Italian*.

Lastly, As I noted, it is confessed by the Papists, That *Mystery Babylon*, *Rev.* 17. & 18. *chapters*, is meant of *Rome*; only they think to free themselves from the force of that blow, by telling us, That it's meant of *Rome* in her *Heathenism*, and under the persecuting Emperors. But this is but a poor shift, as may appear, by shewing, That the Antients do write against *Rome*, as *Mystery Babylon*, after the persecuting Emperors were down; for the Papists say, *That* Constatine *put an end to the Persecution, when he was converted*, which was about the year 300, and a few odd years; at which time *Fab. Chron.*

Rhem. Test. Annot. in Rev. 17. the Papists say, *That* Rome *was given up to the Pope.* 1. *Jerome*, who lived about the fourth hundred, writing to *Eustoch. & Marcellus*, doth apply these words to *Rome*, viz. *Fly out of* Babylon, *let every man save his own Soul, for* Babylon *is fallen, and is become the Habitation of Devils.* Yea, he saith further, as he is quoted by the Protestants, *That* Rome *IS the* Babylonical *Harlot, according to the Revelation of St.* John, *appointed for the birth of Antichrist, which there should arise, and exercise all tyranny; and from thence should deceive the whole world with his wicked Wiles.*

Aug. de Civitat. Dei, lib. 18. And *Augustine* is most clear in this matter, in his Book of the *City of God*; where he calls *Rome* another *Babylon* in the West. And *Babylon* in the East, first *Rome*: and *Rome* of *Italy*, second *Babylon*. Willing men to consider, That in the beginning of the *City of God*, which was in *Abraham's* time, the first *Rome*, that was, Eastern *Babylon* was builded in *Chaldea*. And about what the first *Babylon* was destroyed, lest the *City of God* should want her Enemy, the second *Babylon*, which is *Rome* in *Italy*, was erected.

Chrys. in Rev. 13. *Chrysostome* saith, *Antichrist shall invade the vacant Empire of* Rome, *and assay to draw unto himself the Empires both of God and man.* Thus it seems that *Rome* was accounted *Mystery Babylon*, four or five hundred years after Christ; and if she be not now, what she was then in that respect, I desire to be informed where that blood-drunken Fornicatrix, mentioned, *Revelation* 17. is now to be found.

The Ninth Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church hath not thoſe Marks, which they themſelves aſſign as the Marks by which the true Church can only be known infallibly: Therefore the preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, is not the Church of Chriſt.

Thoſe Marks are;

1. *ANTIQUITY.*	4. *VISABILITY.*
2. *SUCCESSION.*	5. *SANCTITY.*
3. *UNIVERSALITY*	6. *UNITY.*
(of Time and Place.	7. *MIRACLES*, &c.

Theſe are the Principal.

The Ninth Reaſon maintained.

THat the preſent Papal Church cannot have the true Mark of *Antiquity*, is thus evidenced; *viz.* The Papal Church is a National Church; But no Goſpel Church was National in the firſt Age: Therefore no National Church hath the true Mark of *Antiquity*.

The ſtrength of this Argument lyeth in the clear difference of the ſtate of the Church under *Abraham* and *Moſes*, to what it was under Chriſt and his Apoſtles. For,

The *Jewiſh* Church, which was to be National, took its form in a National way, even in the very firſt Family where it began, as appears, *Gen.* 17. where Parents, Children, and Servants too, muſt all be brought into that Church-ſtate forthwith, or not be ſuffered to co-habit together. Which order muſt be kept in all the Families of the *Jews*, as well in reſpect of their Servants, ſuch as they bought with money, as their Children, or any other. And ſo the *Jewiſh* Church, both in its beginning and its continuance, acted forth it ſelf in a way ſuitable to it ſelf.

Luk. 12 51, 52, 53. But when the Goſpel Church began, it is very evident, that it took its beginning in the diviſion of Families, and that by vertue of Chriſt's Doctrine; who affirms, That he came to ſend fire on the *Mat.* 10 34, 35. Earth; not Peace, but rather Diviſion: For ſaith he, *From hence-* fire *forth there ſhall be five in one houſe divided three againſt two, and two* *Luke,* *againſt three; the Father againſt the Son, and the Son againſt the Father;* 21. 16. *the Daughter againſt the Mother, and the Mother againſt the Daughter,* 1 *Cor.* 7. &c. *and all this for the Goſpel ſake.* Here a man muſt leave Father, 11, 13, Mother, Wife and Children; For this cauſe ye ſhall be betrayed, 15, 21, both by Parents and Kinsfolks. For this cauſe the unbelieving 22, 23. Husband will put away his believing Wife. And for this cauſe the Servant may refuſe to follow his unbelieving Maſter, being Chriſt's freeman, and yet dwell in his Service as a Servant notwithſtanding.

Thus it's evident, That the Goſpel-Church took its beginning in a way quite contrary to the Form of a National Church, even by turning the World (or Church of the *Jews*) up-ſide-down, which cauſed the *Jews* to cry out, *MEN OF ISRAEL, HELP.*

This is yet more evident, by that thundring Doctrine of the *Mat.* 3. 9. *Baptiſt,* when he ſaid, *Think not, or begin not to ſay within your ſelves, We have* Abraham *to our Father.* No, ſaith *Paul, We* (meaning the 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17, Goſpel-Church) *which are of Faith, are the Seed of* Abraham, *and* 18. *Heirs according to Promiſe*; For the Promiſe (which chiefly) is enjoyed in the Goſpel, was not made to ſuch as were born after the *Gal.* 3. 2 6, 29. Fleſh, but ſuch as are born after the Spirit; Whereupon he ſaith, We henceforth know No man after the Fleſh [or becauſe he de- *Acts* 10 35. ſcends from the loins of *Abraham*, or any other.] For if any man be in Chriſt (ſo as to be a demonſtrable or viſible Member of his *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. Goſpel-Church) he is a new-creature. Old things are paſſed away, [yea, the old priviledge of ſtanding in the Church by the Father's intereſt, though the Seed of *Abraham* himſelf] is [now] paſſed, behold all things [in this reſpect] are become new. Whereupon *Peter* contributeth his ſentence, and ſaith, *Of a truth I perceive God is no reſpecter of Perſons,* [*but* the Perſons accepted upon a Goſpel-account, ſo as to be his Church, are ſuch as *in every Nation fear him, and work Righteouſneſs* [which no *Infant* can do.] But what? Hath God rejected *Infants* wholly, that now he will not ſhew them ſo much favour as afore-time? God forbid. He hath not ſhut up his tender Mercies from them wholly, or in part; For as they are ſuch, and dying

dying in their infancy through *Adam's* transgression, so in Christ shall they be made alive. Wherefore look how far soever they fall in the first man of the Earth, so far they shall be restored by the Lord from Heaven; yea, the Gift to them by Christ shall exceed the Loss they had by *Adam*. But if they live to years of understanding, and become actual sinners against God, then the way appointed for the remission of their sins, is, *to repent, and be baptized, every one of them, that they may receive the holy Ghost*, and so be by it led *into all Truth*; *and attain at the end the salvation of their souls, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* *Rom.* 5. 16, 18. *Acts* 2. 38, *to* 41.

Another Argument whereby it appears the Church of Christ cannot be National, is this; No man is bound to become a Christian under pain of corporal punishment, as Death, &c. but living peaceably as men, no man hath power to compel them to be baptized, or to walk in the Christian Profession, as is clear from the Texts before recited. Now take away Force in matters of Religion, and a National Church cannot stand in an absolute National Form; this all experience can testifie.

Again, That the Church of Christ at the first, or in the first Ages was not National (in the first method or way wherein a Church beginneth to be so, namely, by the admission of Infants into the Church) is very evident; because it is utterly incredible, that the many thousands of Infants, of such as in those dayes believed, should be admitted into the Church, and not so much as the whisper of such a thing to be found in all the holy Writings of the Apostles. And beside, I have shewed from the Testimony of *Vives*, (*Augustines* Commentor) That the Church had not the custom to baptize Infants in old time.

It is likewise certain (if History be true) That the Gospel-Church used no compulsion in matters of Faith for more than three hundred years after Christ. About which time *Constantine* ordained grievous punishments for such as spake against Christ; and allowed the *Christians*, to use the Unbelievers hardly. But God did not bless these doings: for *Constantine* became an *Arrian* Heretick, and persecuted the Bishop that baptized him, as also others that continued faithful. *Fab. Chron. 4th part. Yet this* Eusebius *doth seem to contradict.*

Hence then I conclude, That seeing the present Papal Church of *Rome* hath not the true Mark of Antiquity, Therefore they lose at once, the next three, *Succession*, *Universality*, and *Visibility*: For,

Antiquity

Antiquity being wanting, no true Succeſſion can be found; becauſe the Root of Succeſſion, if good, muſt be the Antiquity of it. So take Antiquity from them, and then wanting that firſt Age, they cannot be found in every Age; and not being found in every Age, eſpecially the firſt Age, then they loſe *Viſibility*, as themſelves propoſe it for a Mark of the Church. And for their *Holineſs*, I have ſpoken to that before, and ſurely it is but like their neighbours. And for their *Miracles*, I have given you a taſte of them from *Loreto*: and beſide, others do claim that mark as well as they; Yea, the *Turks* produce Miracles; and the *Proteſtants* do the like; and others, as the *Quakers*, the like: and the *Baptists* can ſay of a truth, that God hath done for and amongſt them, ſome things which have exceeded the courſe of Nature. And ſo their Miracles will not more prove them a Church, than the Miracles of others will prove the contrary, unleſs they can prove the others to be Illuſions.

Willit. Synopſ. Papiſ.

And that they have not the mark of *Unity*, is evident, if Hiſtory may be heeded; for, ſaith my Author, there is an hundred Sects of Monks and Fryars amongſt them, and ſome of them ſo divided, as they burnt one another for matters of Religion. And for different Opinions, there are no leſs than three hundred. See *Fox Act. and Monument. p.* 260. and *Willit*, in his Book called, *Tetraſtilon Papiſ.*

I know the *Papiſts* do make a great deal of noiſe about their *Paſtoral Succeſſion*, as if they could derive it from man to man, up to the Apoſtle *Peter*. But I find the learned *Proteſtants* making it a great Queſtion, whether ever *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*, or not. And *Ferom* is ſaid to have ſeen ſome old Books, which ſhew, that *Narciſſus* ruled the *Roman Church*, when *Paul* ſaluted him and his Family, in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*.

Jerome, in ep. ad Rom.

No ſmall contention is there likewiſe among the Learned, Whether *Linus* or *Clement* were the ſecond Biſhop of *Rome*: So that this Paſtoral Succeſſion the Papiſts pretend to, meets with ſhrewd Objections in the very firſt and ſecond perſon of that Line.

Againſt the uninterrupted continuance of their pretended *Succeſſion*, many things are objected: as, That there were ſometimes *three*, and ſometimes *two* Popes, and that for more than twenty years time together; ſo that no man could tell where the true Paſtoral Authority lay. And then comes in that ſtrange diſaſter of *Joan* the female Pope, who for almoſt three years cut the chain of this pretended Succeſſion. This thing is famous in Hiſtory.

Laſtly,

Lastly, Although the *Papists* could prove a continued Succession of persons claiming the Title of *Universal Bishop*, yet this would not justifie them all to be the Pastors of Christ's Church. For these two Rules are given us even by the Antients; 1. That *Peter* left his Innocency hereditary as well as his Seat; and that he which hath not the one as well as the other, is not *Peter's Successor*. 2. That it is not the *Chair*, but the *Doctrine* that maketh a Bishop. Now, 3dly, add but *Paul's* Rule in this matter, 1 *Tim.* 3. and *Titus* 1. and then I am bold to affirm, That many Popes of *Rome* were not the true Successors of *Peter* in Pastoral Authority. For I find it laid to the charge of divers Popes, that they were Drunken-Whoremongers, Theeves, given more to War than Christ, rooted in all unspeakable sin; furious men, prophane Scoffers of Christ; Incestuous persons, Murderers, Poysoners of their own Parents and Kindred; open Sodomites or Buggerers; Blasphemers, incorrigible Hereticks, Enchanters; callers upon the Devil to help them to play at Dice; Drinkers of the Devil's Health, and Traitors to Princes. These things are so notorious and evidently true of the Popes of *Rome*, as that the Papists do not deny them. T. B. *End to Controversy*. and the Author of the *Seven Queries*, as you may see in part before. Yea, *Bernard* was not a little moved with the wickedness of the Popes of *Rome*, when he called them, *Tyrants*, *Defrauders*, *Raveners*, *Traytors*, *Darkness of the World*, *Wolves* and *Devils*. And, can we think that Succession to be good which is derived from Devils? I need say no more. See, for the proof of all that I have said, these Books; *Fox Act.* & *Monuments*, *Willet Synopf.* *Prediaux's Introduct.*

The

The Tenth Reaſon.

The preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers, and they only, are the true viſible Church of Jeſus Chriſt: Therefore the preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Explanation of this Reaſon, or Argument.

THis Reaſon or Argument is not ſo to be underſtood, as if we do ſhut all men out of Heaven who are not Members of our Church. No verily: This is the expreſs Doctrine of the Papiſts: for they ſay, *that out of the Church is no Salvation*; and by Church they mean, only thoſe that adhere to the *Papal Church* of *Rome*: and hereupon they teach expreſly (and ſo do ſome Proteſtants alſo) *That without Baptiſm, or the deſire of Baptiſm, &c. none can be ſaved*: And therefore it is that they give power to Midwives to baptize Children ſometimes between the Womb and the World.

That which we teach, is this, That the ordinary way appointed
Luk.24 for men to receive Salvation in, is, *The preaching of Repentance and Remiſſion of ſins to all Nations, in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*; *and the adminiſtration of Baptiſm, as a pledge thereof, to all that give acceptance to theſe Glad-tydings*; and upon this account this Miniſtration is called, *The Baptiſm of Repentance for the remiſſion of ſins.* And we do teach, as a moſt infallible Doctrine, *That without profeſſion of Faith, manifeſtation of Repentance, and being baptized with Water in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, &c. no perſon can be orderly admitted into the Church or Kingdom of God on Earth.* And that therefore it concerns every man, living to years of underſtanding, and having the Goſpel tendred to him, only to look for Salvation this way, as he will anſwer it before the Lord, for contemning God's ordinary way, and preſuming to challenge the Grace of Eternal Life in a way of his own deviſing.

Nevertheleſs, we do not hence conclude, That all perſons ſhall be damned that ſeek not Life in this way. For, firſt, No Infant can ſeek for it in the way which the Goſpel propoſeth Life to men of years: Yet ſurely it is a moſt cruel Doctrine to ſay, that any Infants dying in their infancy ſhall be damned in Hell, becauſe (as one

one very well ſaid) God will not damn any perſons for that which they cannot help.

Again, in *Rom.* 1ſt. and 2d. chapters, *Paul* teacheth, That if the ſons of men act forth themſelves in a way of Love, Fear, Obedience, and Reverence to their Creator, according to the means of Light vouchſafed to them, that this ſhall be as much as ſhall be required of them, in the day when God ſhall judge the ſecrets of all men by Jeſus Chriſt (for God will not gather where he hath not ſtrewed) at which time, God will not judge them by the Law that never had it. Howbeit, let all that have it (I mean his written Law) expect to be judged by it. And therefore, though we will not preſume to judge of the final ſtate of this or that Society of men profeſſing conſcionably this or that Form of Worſhip, but leave that wholly to the Lord; yet we will not ceaſe humbly to beg of all ſuch perſons in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, that they having his Law, would carefully obſerve the terms whereupon Life is held forth unto them, and become ſuch glad receivers of the Word, as is mentioned, *Acts* 2. 41. *Then they which gladly received the Word, were baptized: and the ſame day were added to the Church about three thouſand ſouls.* The Argument thus explained, I ſhall now endeavour to make it good.

The Tenth Argument maintained.

That the preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers, and no other preſent Aſſemblies of men, are the true Church of Chriſt, I prove, thus: Either the preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers, or elſe ſome other Aſſemblies now in the practice of Infant * Baptiſm, muſt be the true Church of Chriſt; becauſe without Baptiſm, the Papiſts ſay (and ſay truly too) there can be no true Church of Chriſt at this day: Now theſe two wayes of Baptizing only (I mean of Water-Baptiſm) is pretended as neceſſary in order to a viſible Church-ſtate: *viz.* the dipping or baptizing perſons upon their perſonal profeſſion of Faith, as the preſent Aſſemblies of the *Baptiſts* do practiſe; or baptizing (or rather ſprinkling) of Infants without perſonal profeſſion of Faith, as the preſent National Churches do practiſe.

* *Alias, Rantiſm*

For moſt undoubtedly, the true and legitimate claim to this Title of *Chriſt's Church*, muſt be found in one of theſe two Parties: And that no National Aſſembly, gathered together by Pedo-baptiſm, can fairly claim this Title, I have ſhewed before, whither now I refer my Reader. And for the evincing yet further, that the preſent Aſ-

semblies of Baptized Believers are the true visible Church of Christ, I thus argue:

They, and they only, have the true Ecclesiastical Marks of truly Antient Primitive or Apostolical Gathering, Constitution and Government: Therefore they, and they only, are the true Church of Jesus Christ.

These three points, namely, *Gathering*, *Constitution* and *Government*, I take (if right) to be the infallible Marks of a true Church. And that the present Assemblies of Baptized Believers, and they only, have them, will be evident to him that considereth what they were at first, and how they agree with what in these respects is only found in the Assemblies of the Baptized Congregations.

The truly Antient, Primitive and Apostolical Gathering, in respect of the first means used in order thereunto, was the preaching Repentance and Remission of sins, or the Gospel *unto every Creature*; and upon their conviction, to command them, as from the Lord, to be baptized, *every one of them*, in the Name, &c. as appears, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. *Acts* 2. 38. *Acts* 8. 37. *Acts* 10. 47, 48. And herein onely the present Assemblies of Baptized Believers do closely follow Christ's Primitive Ministers.

The Primative and Apostolical Gathering of the Church of Christ in respect of the subjects gathered, were only such, as through the virtue and prevalency of the Word preached, or made known, did give a demonstration of their Regeneration by the profession of Faith, and manifestation of Repentance, and being dipped in Water in the Name of the Father, *&c.* For the proof whereof I appeal to those several Scriptures alledged against the gathering of Christ's Church of such persons, as of whose Regeneration no demonstration is or can be given, answerable to what the Scripture doth require, in order to persons admission into the Kingdom of God or Church on Earth. And, secondly, I appeal to the practice of the Apostles acting, in pursuance of that Commission given them in that behalf. And, thirdly, I do appeal to the Churches themselves, which were gathered by the Apostles, as they are described to us in these several Texts following.

These Texts do shew to the diligent Reader, that here is such things spoken of this numerous Church, as is necessarily exclusive of any Infants being admitted into their Society, as to participate of any Church Ordinance: And the like will appear to the Scripture-searching Soul, in all those other Churches; as the respective places will sufficiently convince.

I have it freely granted, under the hand of a learned Clergyman, That Churches, *at the first*, were gathered only as we affirm: but he tells me, That when Persecution ceased, God took in all Nations, or whole Nations; which hitherto he hath not proved.

The Church at *Jerusalem.* { *Acts* 1. 15, 21, 22. *Acts* 2. 41, 42. *Heb.* 5, 6, & 8, *Chapters.*

The Church at *Samaria.* { *Acts* 8. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.

The Church at *Cesaria.* { *Acts* 10. 33, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48.

The Church at *Antioch.* { *Acts* 11. 20, 21, 23, 26. *Acts* 13. 12. with *Acts* 9. 38.

The Church at *Philippi.* { *Acts* 16. 12, 13, 14, 15, 31, 32, 33, 34, 40. *Phil.* 1. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

The Church at *Thessalonica.* { *Acts* 17. 1, 2, 3, 4. 2 *Thess.* 1. 3, 10, 11.

The Church at *Colosse.* { *Colos.* 1. 4, 5, 6. *Colos.* 2. 10, 11, 12.

The Church at *Corinth.* { *Acts* 8. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. 1 *Cor.* 1. 2.

The Church at *Rome.* { *Acts* 28. 24. *Rom.* 6. 3, 14.

The Church at *Ephesus.* { *Acts* 19. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. *Ephes.* 1. 13, 14, 15.

The Church at *Galatia.* { *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28, 29. *Gal.* 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

These Scriptures, duely considered, shew, That all those famous Churches were gathered in a way contrary to that of the National Churches, and consonant to the way of the present Baptized Churches. And be it here observed, that no man ever yet could shew by any Record of such Authority as may suffice to be a Foundation of Faith in this case, that by the Apostles any were ever admitted into the Church in their infancy. Wherefore look well upon the Scripture, and then upon the gathering of the Churches of the *Baptists*, and you will find that they, and they only, have the true Antient Primitive or Apostolical-mark of Church-gathering.

Of CONSTITUTION.

THey onely can be truly constituted that are rightly gathered, which the Baptized Churches onely are. The Primitive Constitution of the Church consisted principally in these two heads; *viz.* Free-fellowship in the Doctrine of the Apostles; *Acts* 2. 40, 41, 42, 47. *Joh.* 1. 11, 12, 13. *Act.* 17. 4. 1 *Thess.* 1. 5, 6, 9. 1 *John* 1. 3. *Rev.* 22. 17.

No force of a worldly nature was used in the begetting or continuing her Fellowship, for it was a mutual consent.

The second thing pertaining to the Constitution, consists in the disposing of her Members to those places to which they are fitted to serve in the body, 1 *Cor.* 12. 27. with vers. 18. 28. *Acts* 6. 3, 4.

Now that the present Assemblies of the Baptized Believers, have this form of Constitution in both respects, is evident to all that will take knowledge of their Constitution.

Of GOVERNMENT.

THe true Ancient Primitive and Apostolical Government of the Church, was only Spiritual, and did recide not in the Pastors apart from the Church, but in the Pastors together with the Church; yet so, as that those to whom the Church hath committed her Power, are the Instruments, that in the Name of Christ and his Church, are to exercise Government, *Matth.* 18. 17, 18. 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. & 5. 20.

This Government consisteth in these things; Exhortations, Rebukes, Reproofs, *&c.* with all long-Suffering and Doctrine,

2 *Tim.*

2 *Tim.* 1. 2. And if this prevail not with the Offenders, then is the power of Excommunication to be exerciſed, to the with-holding their Priviledges in the Church, and to the delivering them up to Satan for the deſtruction of the Fleſh; and for ſaving the ſinner from his ſin. And if this prevail not, then the ſinners ſin is retained, till the day of Judgment. But if the ſinner be humbled, the ſin is by the Church to be remitted, and the Offender reſtored, *Matth.* 18. 17, 18. 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5, 11, 13. 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 6, 14, 15. *Tit.* 3. 11. *Joh.* 20. 23.

And this Government is to be exerciſed without partiality, 1 *Tim.* 5. 21. and without reſpect to filthy lucre, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. and without domination or lordſhip, 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 6, 7, 8.

Now that this Goverment is only found in the preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers, is thus proved; *Out* of the Church it cannot be, and *in* the Church it muſt be, *Epheſ.* 4. till all the Saints be perfected; and that this Society, and no other, can be the Church, I have alſo proved; and for further evidence I refer every one to the exerciſe of the preſent Churches of baptized Believers, in point of Eccleſiaſtical Government.

As for other Marks, it is needleſs to inſiſt upon them; for that Church which hath *theſe*, cannot be without the *other*, ſo far as they are neceſſary. Yea, let it be well obſerved, That that Church which hath true *Antiquity*, is the Church alone, which hath the Promiſe of Succeſſion, or whatſoever elſe is needful in a way of neceſſity in order to her being: And therefore, though we could not prove by Hiſtory, thoſe things which many make great boaſt of; yet, having the moſt certain Mark [*Antiquity*] we have the other in Promiſe, and therefore muſt believe that the Church hath not failed of the accompliſhment of them; for Hiſtories (ſome of them) be quite loſt; and others, partly ſilent, and partly contradictory about theſe things. Again, if Hiſtory did mention an un-interrupted continuance of Baptized Churches, ſuch, I mean, as we contend for, yet it would be but *Teſtis humanus*, and ſo no foundation of Faith: And beſide, it would ſuppoſe, that the Church of Chriſt is ſo beholding to humane Hiſtory, as it's impoſſible for her to prove her ſelf the Church of Chriſt without it, though ſhe have the holy Scripture. But this is ſurely to make the Church to ſtand upon too ſandy a foundation.

THE END.

The Printer to the Reader.

Courteous Reader.

THe Author being at a great diſtance, ſo that he could not attend the Preſs, this Treatiſe was haſtily read over by a Friend of his, who having obſerved theſe few faults, deſires thee to correct them with thy Pen, as alſo any other which thou ſhalt meet with, that probably he hath overſeen.

Page 16. line 19. for *will allow*, reade, *will not allow*. P. 20. l. 23. f. *theſe following*, r. *in theſe things following*. P. 31. l. 22. f. *they advance*, r. *they might advance*.

THE BAPTIST AGAINST THE PAPIST:

OR,

The SCRIPTURE and *ROME* in Contention about the SUPREAM SEAT of JUDGMENT, in CONTROVERSIES of RELIGION.

Together with

Ten *Arguments* or *Reasons*, discovering the present Papal Church of *Rome*, to be no true Church of Christ.

WHEREIN

It is also evinced, That the present *Assemblies* of *Baptized Believers*, are the true Church of Jesus Christ.

By THO. GRANTHAM, a Prisoner for Truths sake.

Luke 16.29,31. *They have* Moses *and the Prophets, let them hear them. —If they hear not* Moses *and the Prophets, neither will they be perswaded though one should rise from the dead.*

Ezek. 20. 18,19. *But I said unto their children— Walk ye not in the Statutes of your fathers, &c. —I am the Lord your God, walk in my Statutes, and keep my Judgments, and do them —*

Joh. 12.48. *The Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge you in the last day.*

LONDON, Printed in the Year, [illegible].

1663 1663

THE AUTHOR TO THE READER.

Courteous Reader,

NOt because I envy those of the Papal Church, or desire them any evil; Not that I desire they should be exposed to a suffering condition for matters of Religion, or that they should be denied any liberty in that respect which I desire my self, nor for any other prejudice (God knoweth) do I publish this small Treatise: But because I judge my self concerned at this time to give my Testimony for the Truth, against some Papal Tenents; for divers causes: As first,

I am at this time under restraint, and though nothing hath been laid to my charge, yet it is rumour'd by some that I am a Papist; yea, in this place of my Confinement, have I been told to my face by some of the Protestant Clergie, that I am a Roman Jesuite. And indeed this is an ordinary aspersion which hath been cast upon those in general to whom I am related upon a religious account, viz. That we are all Papists, or will turn Papists, &c. and this, not so much to our personal prejudice, as to the dishonour of that antient way of Truth by us professed. Secondly,

A more particular occasion of the publication of this Treatise, proceeded from the Papists themselves, in sending Seven Queries to the Baptized Congregations in this County (commonly called Anabaptists.) To which, through the importunity of some Friends, I formed a brief Answer; little thinking, I confess, that so much contention would have risen thereupon, as since I have met with. And I likewise confess, that the undertaking is such, as that it requireth a more fit Instrument than my self to manage it.

Nevertheless, I hope I may say, that hitherto what hath come to pass in this contest, hath fallen out rather to the furtherance of the Truth: for which cause I have thought fit to offer it to the perusal of others, so much of it I mean, as I conceive is at present needful; and that is the substance of what hath passed about the means whereby we must decide or resolve Controversies in Religion.

It now wants but few months, of a year, since I sent my final Answer, containing a Review of all that had been said in way of Answer to the Queries before, in which I produced the Testimony of divers Antient Writers, as concurring with what I had therein spoken, and, as being directly opposite to my Antagonists.

But I have heard of late, that he is gone out of this Nation, so that I expect no more Reply from him. And though for divers Reasons hereafter shewed, I have not published the whole Discourse (which, if need be, may in due time be brought to light) yet I have thought it meet here to set down all the Seven Queries, *that so if any Christian, of suitable endowments, for the Vindication of Truth, against the opposition that lyeth in the said* Queries, *shall think fit to lay forth his Talent in that Service, he may take hold of this occasion wherein to do it, (for the Queries were not directed to any particular person) however, I shall joyn to each Query, one* Antiquery, *which may serve at this present to blunt the edge of them, as they carry an opposition to the Truth.*

The QUERIES.

Query 1.

WHether we are to resolve all Differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God?

Query 2.

How know you precisely what is the true Word of God?

Query 3.

How know you that your Copies and Translations of the Bible are the true Word of God? since the Original Writings are not come to

The ANTI-QUERIES.

Antiq. 1.

WHat Differences in point of Religion can you resolve without the written Word of God? and whether the written Word of God be a perfect Rule for matters of Religion?

Antiq. 2.

Whether some Book must not of necessity speak for it self? and whether the Scripture doth not best deserve this priviledge? And whether it be not a bold presumption to say, there are no holy Books but them which we or you have received for such, seth those which we have, tell us, there are other holy Writings, which never yet came to our hands, nor to yours?

Antiq. 3.

What Copies and Translations of the Bible have you that are more true than ours? and where are the Original Manuscripts of the Prophets and

Qu. 4.

Where we differ about the sense of the Word, by whom must we be tryed? the dead Letter cannot explain it self.

Antiq. 4.

When we differ about the true Church, and about the meaning of Authors, by whom must we be tryed? They cannot speak for themselves more than the Scripture: and whether the Scriptures, compared together, do not explain themselves? also, whether it be not an opprobrious and ignominious speech for you to call the Scripture a dead Letter? and whether the true lovers of the Scripture ever vouchsafed it such ill, and indeed improper language?

Qu. 5.

What clear Text have you out of Scripture for the procession of the holy Ghost from the Father & the Son? or, for changing the Sabbath from *Saturday* to *Sunday*? or prohibiting Poligamy, or Infant-Baptism? And whether there be not as clear Texts to prove unwritten Tradition, *Purgatory*, and the *real Presence*?

Antiq. 5.

Whether the Baptism of the true Church be not one? and whether that one be not expresly found in the Scripture? And whether the Scripture doth not prohibit all beside that one? And whether the Papists have not confessed in many of their Books, that Infant-Baptism is not found in, nor grounded upon the Scripture? and then, whether it be not clear, that all the Texts which speak of Baptism, do not prohibit Infant-Baptism? Also, whether Joh. 15. 26. *and* 14. 26. *and* 16. 7. *be not clear Texts that the holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son? Also, whether* 1 Cor. 7. 1, 2, 3. *do not as much prohibit one man for having two Wives, and one woman for having two Husbands? and whether it do not clearly prohibit the latter? Also, whether there be any that hold the first day under the notion of a Sabbath among the Baptized Churches? and yet whether there be not clear Texts for the religious observation of it? Act.* 20. 7. *Also, whether it be not absurd for you to ask for clear Texts to prove unwritten things? Also, whether Purgatory, and the Real Presence, as you hold them, is not plainly destructive to some Articles of the Christian Faith?*

BAPTIST.

be like a Book bound and sealed up; as ver. 16 & 17. compared with ch. 29. 11, 12. The Prophet likewise foreseeing, that when God should hide his face, *Israel* would enquire of Wisards, and such as spoke from familiar Spirits (as *Saul* did, when under the like judgment, as 1 *Sam.* 28. 6, 7, 8.) wherefore the Prophet, that he might warn the remnant of faithful ones, whom he foresaw would be as wonders amongst the rest, commands them, as from the Lord, that WHEN men should say unto them, Seek unto such as have familiar spirits, *&c.* to go to the LAW, as being their way to go to God himself: for saith he, *Should not a People seek unto their God? To the LAW, &c.* and certifies them that by that they should know Deceivers; for, saith he, *If they speak not according to This Word*, [the Law] *there is no light in them*: So that I infer thus much, that when such as are enemies to the Church come to invade the Saints with their deceit, the only infallible way to know them to be Deceivers, is, to enquire of God's Law and Testimony. I know that *Israel* had the Testimony or standing Oracle, beside the written Law. And the *Church* now hath the new Testimony open in the *Church*, beside the Law & Prophets; & hereunto, I say, the Church is only to apply her self, as aforesaid, to find out the deceit of those who would rob her of that inheritance, which she holdeth by the deeds of God's Law, and Promises, contained in

PAPIST.

given them to convince such Oracles of falshood, if they speak not according to the Word or Prophesie *of* Isaiah. *This is the clear sense of that place, out of which you draw this strange consequence.* Ergo, *the Scripture, &c. is to resolve all matters of Faith. A strange Consequence. I say, as will appear, if we turn your Enthymeme into a Syllogism, thus: Recourse is to be had rather to the Law, than to false Oracles, whose falsehood appears, if they speak not according to the Word or Prophecy of* Isaiah. *But if this be so, the* Scriptures, &c. *are to resolve all points of Faith.* Ergo, &c. *What a prodigious* minor *have we here? How doth it follow, that because God's Word is to be more credited than superstitious Oracles; or, that such Oracles are not to be credited, when they speak against God's Word: Therefore the Scriptures, &c. are to resolve all points of Faith. I know you have not the word* rather *in your English Translation as we have in ours, but the clear sense of the place bears as much.*

1 Tim. 6. 3. *saith, they are proud that teach contrary to the Doctrine of Christ.* Ergo, *you infer that the Scripture is to judge whose Doctrine is of pride.*

This

BAPTIST.

Scripture; by theſe, as the *only infallible Rule*, ſhe knows thoſe to be lyars, *who ſay they are the Church, and are not.*

And to this agrees the next three Scriptures, the very reading whereof ſheweth, that when the Controverſie is between the Church and ſuch as pretend falſly to that Title, the onely infallible means to refel them, is, the *Spirit ſpeaking in Scripture, &c.*

For thus ſaith the firſt of them: *If any man teach otherwiſe, and conſent not to wholſom words, even the words of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Doctrine that is according to Godlineſs, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about queſtions, &c.*

Thus ſaith the ſecond, *He that knoweth God, heareth us: he that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth, and the ſpirit of Error.*

The third ſaith thus, *Whoſo tranſgreſſeth, and abideth not in the Doctrin of Chriſt, hath not God. He that abideth in the Doctrine of Chriſt, hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this Doctrine, receive him not into your houſe, neither bid him God-ſpeed.*

From theſe Texts it appears, that unleſs the *Papiſts* can produce ſomething which they can infallibly prove to be Chriſt's Doctrine, beſide what is contained in holy Scripture; or, that the Apoſtles may be heard as infallibly by ſome other means, as by the holy Scripture; or, that the Saints

PAPIST.

This is as mad a concluſion as the laſt; for when there is no clear Text of Scripture for either ſide, as it often happens, or Scripture brought on both ſides; How can the Scripture judge whether party be proud? or, how can it be judge of its own ſenſe, when it is alleged on both ſides, who both pretend to have the Spirit and Reaſon on their ſides?

1 John 4.6. *Thoſe that hear not the Apoſtles, are not of God, nor have his Spirit.* Ergo, *ſay you, the Scripture reſolves who are religious: Doth it follow out of this Text, that when parties contend, that they hear the Apoſtles, the Scripture, can reſolve the difference, and pronounce who are religious? &c.* Not at all.

2 John 9. 10. *Gives Judgement againſt thoſe that follow not Chriſt's Doctrine. You infer* ergo *the Scripture muſt try whether men bring this Doctrine. Strange Logick: for unleſs your Text proved that the Scripture containes all Chriſt's Doctrine, which it doth not, your Conſequence muſt needs be faulty.*

2 Theſſ. 3. 2. *you ſay proves, that Reaſon is ſome wayes neceſſary to decide Controverſies in Religion. I will not examine the goodneſs of this Conſequence, but I am ſure you need not have*

BAPTIST.

Saints received ſome Doctrine for Chriſts, that is not contained in the Scripture; I ſay, unleſs they can infallibly ſhew ſomething of this nature, my Anſwer is good. But if they can produce any other thing of ſuch authority, then I acknowledge my Anſwer to be deficient. Howbeit, if any man, or the Church her ſelf, do decide a Controverſie, by inſiſting upon the Scripture, this is no more than my Anſwer included; for I do not imagine that the Church muſt not pronounce what is contained in the Scripture: but if ſhe hath power to ſpeak as from the Lord (in theſe dayes) when yet the Scripture ſaith no ſuch thing, then I profeſs my ſelf ſhort of underſtanding the power of the Church.

2 Theſſ. 3. 2. I only made uſe of this Text thus far, that in Religious Controverſies the Apoſtle gives Reaſon her place, and therefore deſired to be delivered from unreaſonable men.

PAPIST.

brought Scripture to have proved ſo manifeſt a Truth, which cannot be denied by any, but ſuch as pretend to have ſo much of the Spirit, that me-thinks they ſhould have little need of the uſe of Reaſon.

BAPTIST.

Concerning my five Texts, and what I infer thence, *I* need not ſpeak much here; yet it is worthy obſerving how apparantly you miſs the clear ſenſe of *Iſa.* 8. 20. whilſt you reſtrain the relatives [this word] to the Word or Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, whereas it is as clear as the Sun at noon, that they ought to be referr'd to the Law and Teſtimony; for thus *I* read, *To the Law and to the Teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to This Word.* Having thus miſſed the ſence of the Text, then in all that you ſay further, you diſcover a taunting ſpirit, endeavouring to beſpatter me with what dirt comes next to hand.

I did not quote any one of the *five Texts*, as taking it ſingly to prove the whole Aſſertion; and therefore you did injure my underſtanding, to argue from them apart, as brought to prove the whole Poſition; but I brought them to prove ſuch Propoſitions, as being laid together, do amount to ſo much as my Aſſertion (as I explicate it) doth contain. For the firſt *four Texts* do *all of them* ſhew, how God's People ought to try and defend themſelves againſt ſuch as oppoſe the Church and Truth of God, as I ſhewed in my *Rejoynder*: and the *fifth*, gives Reaſon her place in Religious Conteſts. But there is not one of the Arguments which I formed from my *five Quotations*, but you deprave and abuſe it, by both adding terms of your own,

own, and omitting mine; yea, sometimes whole sentences: and when you have so done, you flout at the Conclusions. Which dealing is too bad for a sober Disputant,

It were a very easie thing to turn all your Objections here against the Scripture as insufficient to resolve differences in Religion, upon the Church as therefore insufficient to resolve them. For, whereas you say, That when both Parties pretend to have Scripture and Reason on their sides, then the Scripture cannot decide the Controversie; Might not I as well say, when both parties pretend to have the Church on their side (as that's the case between us) the Church then cannot decide our difference?

Again, where you seem to say, that when both parties contending, do say they hear the Apostles, that then the Apostles cannot (as they speak in the Scriptures) decide the Controversie: Hath not this the same force against the Church, when both parties contend they hear the Church? See how you can defend your self, and I doubt not but therein you will defend my Arguments for the Scripture.

And because you do cry up the Fathers, *&c.* for so clear a way to decide all our Controversies, I will therefore shew you, that they do clearly avouch the *Answer* which I have given to this your first *Query*, as will evidently appear to the impartial Reader of the several Quotations which I have before alledged, and which do here follow.

The ANSWER *to the* FIRST QUERY, *Avouched sufficient by the Sentence of divers* DOCTORS, *both Antient and Modern.*

WHether of us be Schismaticks? ask not me, I will not ask you. Let Christ be asked, that he may shew us his Church. *Aug. cont. Petil. c. 8*

Neither must I alledge the *Nicene* Council; nor you the *Arimi*. I am neither bound to the one, nor you to the other; let the matter be tryed by the Scripture. *Aug. cont. Max.*

Augustine saith, Let the Scriptures judge; let Christ judge; let the Apostles judge. Yea, it is confessed by the Papists, that *Optatus*, and *Basil*, summoned their Adversaries to the arbitriment of holy Scriptures, and did allow the sufficiency of holy Scripture to decide the Controversies depending between them. *Aug. l. 3. c. 1. S. N. Antid.*

In time past, saith *Chrysostome*, there were many wayes to know the Church of Christ (*viz.*) by good Life, by Miracles, by Chastity, *&c.* but from the time that *Heresies* did take hold of the Church, it *IS ONLY* known by the Scripture, which is the true Church.

Again, he saith, The Lord then knowing that so great confusion would come in the latter dayes, therefore willed the Christians that would take to the sureness of true Faith, to have refuge to nothing but to the Scripture; otherwise, saith he, if they regard other things they shall perish, not understanding what the true Church is.

[Thus my Answer is avouched good, as it respects the means to decide the differences which are about the Church. Next, hear what they say touching such differences as are in the Church.]

Iren. If there be any disagreement risen up among Christians concerning Controversies in Religion, what better course is there to be taken, than to have our recourse into the Most antient Churches, [which must needs be those planted by the Apostles, considering the time when he lived] and to receive from thence, what shall be certain and manifest.

Augustine. Because the Scripture cannot deceive, whoso feareth to be misled in the obscurity of this Question, let him ask *COUNSEL* of that Church which the *SCRIPTURE*, without any ambiguity pointeth out.

Constantine Mag. There are the Gospel, the Prophets and Apostles, which do teach us what to hold in Religion; wherefore expelling all hostile and bitter contention, let us seek the Solution of these Questions out of the Scriptures. Thus spake this famous Emperor in the Council of *Nice*, at what time the Bishops had like to have jarred into pieces.

THus have I given an impartial Relation of what hath passed between the *Popish Querist* and my *Self*, in our *two last Papers*, (which contains the sum of what passed in the other) as touching this Question about the Judge of Controversies. And now, for further satisfaction, That the Scripture, as aforesaid, ought to be admitted the high Prerogative of Judge in our Debates; consider, that *of necessity it must be so.* My reason is, because either the Scripture, or some other Writings, must be our Judge, especially in this important Question, *WHICH IS THE TRUE CHURCH?* For when we contend about her, it is very unreasonable, that any party contending

contending for that title, should be permitted to give Judgment in their own cause: As for example, The present Assembly of *Papists* say, *That they are the true Church:* and the present Assemblies of *Baptists* say, *That they are the true Church.* Is it fit that either party contending, should here give Judgment decisive? What then must we do? why *of necessity* we must to some Writings, whereby to be decided or agreed in this Controversie. These Writings must be either the Scriptures, or some other; but no other can compare with those, so that they do deserve this Prerogative better than any other.

The *Papists* ordinary way in this difficulty, is to tell us, that we must here be tryed by the Tradition of our Fore-fathers; in which they say, *we cannot be deceived:* which Tradition, they say, is *the only thing that is unquestionable, and needs no other ground to stand upon, but it self.* And against the Scripture's being received, upon its own evidence or authority, they usually do thus object, *that before we can receive what it teacheth, we must be assured of its truth.* And again, they say, *the Scripture may not be the Judge of Controversie, because it may be corrupted, translated, ill interpreted, not rightly understood.* And by these, and other like objections, they usually in all their Writings, invalidate the Scriptures certainty, authority, and sufficiency, that so they advance the authority of their Traditions.

But let it be seriously considered, whether these Objections have not the same force against what they rest upon, which they have against the holy Scripture? First then, whereas they tell us, *the Scripture cannot teach us any thing, till we be assured of its truth:* Doth not this conclude against any other thing as strongly? Ought we not to be assured of the truth of the Church before we receive her documents? Ought we not to be assured of the truth of that Tradition which we receive for the Rule of our Faith? But how must we be assured of the truth of the Papal Church, and Tradition? There is not a man living, that can remember when either began, and so avouch its beginning to be of *divine Institution*, and the continnance of the same ever since its beginning, to have been without any corruption: What then must we do? Why we must search *Romes* Records. And then I ask, are they not as questionable, and liable to mis-interpretations, as easily mis-understood as the Records of God? What is now become of these Objections, the force whereof is evidently against the Papal Church and her Traditions, of the truth whereof we must be assured BEFORE we can be taught by either of them.

I say again, There is not a man of all the *Papists* that can evidence *Rome* to have been a Church two hundred years ago, and then much less one thousand six hundred years ago. So that *OF NECESSITY* we must to the Writings of some men (whom we never saw write one word) to find the Church. And then *I* would know why we may not make enquiry at the Pen of *Paul*, what the Church was at first, and what it ought to be now, as well as at the Pen of *Augustine*. Cannot the Pen of *Peter* the Apostle give us as good information in this matter, as the Pen of any *Pope*, pretending to be his Successor? If the *Papists* answer, That we know not the Pen of *Peter* or *Paul*: We answer, as well as they know the Pen of *Augustine* or *Gregory*. If they say *Paul's* Writings may be corrupted, and must be interpreted, may be mis-understood. *I* return the same Answer of all other Books whatsoever; yea, those which contains *Romes* Tradition. See therefore what is gained by devising objections against the authority or certainty of the holy Scriptures. Such doings do only tend to the destruction of all Faith, making every thing doubtful, and the effect is the ushering in of all uncleanness on the one hand, or if men miss this snare, they are catched in another, *viz.* to walk at random as their own, or other mens fancy leads them. This is evident by what we have seen in the *Ranters* on the one hand, and the *Papists* and *Quakers* on the other.

Let us trace this matter a little further, thus. The *Papists* Traditions (most, if not all of which, have been committed to Writing several hundreds of years ago) must speak for themselves, are unquestionable of themselves, must challenge no ground but themselves to stand upon: But the sacred Scripture which hath especial Promise from God for its preservation, *Psal.* 12. must have none of these high priviledges allowed it; Is not this a most peccant Assertion? Again, *Peter* and *Paul* must be no Judges of Controversies in Religion, as they speak to us in their Epistles; but the *Popes* of *Rome*, dead long ago, and now only speak in their Writings, yet they must be our infallible Judges in these Controversies. The great Council of Apostles, Elders, and Brethren, *Acts* 15. can be no Judge of any Controversie, though their Decrees are yet extant among us; but the Council of *Trent*, who only speak in their Decrees, must be our Judge, and that *so* as from their Judgments no appeal can be admitted. The Apostolical Council sends forth their Decrees in the Name of the holy Ghost, and themselves; and in those their Decrees, they prohibit the eating of blood, and strangled things, *&c.* But the Papal Councils will send forth a Decree directly

opposite

opposite to this, and yet sign'd with these powerful words; *Visum est Spiritui Sancto & nobis*. If we appeal in this matter to the Apostolical Council, they may not be permitted to pronounce a Sentence decisive. But *from* the sentence of the Papal Council we must in no wise appeal. Can any thing be said more unworthily?

Thus then, First, the godly Reader may perceive, That whether he be able to answer all the cunning Objections that men, by reason of the long experience they have had in the wayes of deceit, have found out; yet he hath an Argument of *NECESSITY* wherewith to oppose their subtilty. And, Secondly, he hath the advantage of all their own objections, against themselves; yea, against their Church, Tradition, and all that they stand upon. Being seasonably retorted upon them. Wherefore I shall conclude with the *Psalmist's* words, *Psal.* 64. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

They encourage themselves in an evil matter: they commune of laying snares privily; they say, Who shall see them?

They search out iniquities, they accomplish a diligent search: both the inward thoughts of every one of them, and the heart is deep.

But God shall shoot at them with an arrow, suddenly shall they be wounded.

So they shall make their own tongues to fall upon themselves: all that see them, shall flee away.

And all men shall fear, and shall declare the work of God: for they shall wisely consider of his doings.

THE SECOND PART, SHEWETH,

That the present Papal Church *of* Rome, *is not the* Church *of* Christ, *for divers important Causes or Reasons.*

WE have heard of how dangerous a Consequence that Papal Opinion is, which leads them to set up their own Authority (under pretence of their being the Church) above the holy Scripture; insomuch as they allow it no Authority, till it be delivered to us for God's Word, by their Church; so that by this Doctrine, we must find their Church, before we can find the Word of God, as it is contained in the Scripture.

Upon which Consideration, we shall endeavour to shew, That the present Papal Church, is not the true Church of Christ; and therefore what Power soever the Church hath, yet they cannot have it; Because they are not the Church of Christ.

The First Reason.

The present Papal Church of *Rome*, cannot possibly prove her self to be the Church of Christ: Therefore she is not the Church of Christ.

The First Reason maintained.

THE Consequence of the Argument no understanding man can deny; for unless a party pretending to be the Church of Christ, can some wayes sufficiently prove that they are his Church, they cannot reasonably blame any body that refuses so to account of them. And for the Antecedent, namely, that it is impossible for the present

Papal Church to prove her self the Church of Christ, it is evident from this ground, *viz.* They make both the Scripture, and all other Writings, depend on their Church for their Authority; and therefore they must prove themselves to be the Church without the help of any authentical or authoritative Writings; which thing is impossible for them to do.

Being thus divested of the help of all Records, as is more fully shewed above, there remains now nothing for them to lean upon but their own Evidence, or the Tradition of their Fore-fathers; not that which is contained in any Records, but only that which hath been delivered by word from man to man, *&c.* But alas! what Tradition is this they speak of? Not the Tradition of the Church to us, till the persons delivering the same, be found to be the Church; which, as before, they cannot be found to be, without the Scripture. And for their own Evidence, that may not prove them to be the Church to those that contend with them; it cannot avail them, sith each party contending in this case, will, and may, as reasonably as the *Papists*, look that their own Testimony should be as available for these, as the other for those.

It is as vain here to tell us, they are the Church, because the true marks of the Church do agree to the Papal Church, and none else. For, first, the true marks of the Church are confessed by the *Papists*, to be found in the Scripture; which Scripture they receive not, but from the authority of their Church (*yea, their present Church*) so that till the Scripture can tell us authoritatively which be the marks of the Church, no Church can be found by those marks; nor can the Scripture tell us of those marks authoritatively, till *Rome*, as a Church, give it us for God's Word: So then *Rome* must be found the Church, before there be any marks to find her by; which is impossible. *Author of the Queries*

As for example: To clear this matter further, the *Papists* say, *That Holiness is a mark of the true Church:* But now set the Holy Scripture aside, and how shall I know *holiness* from *unholiness*, without the Scripture? Here the *Papists* being in a strait, rather than they will let the Law of God, or the Scripture, have the preheminence, do Answer thus; That *we have a Law in our Consciences, which dictates what is good, and what is otherwise; and by this Law, even a Heathen may judge our Church holier than any other Congregations of Christians.* *Author of the Queries*

What a miserable plunge (of *Heathenism* or *Quakerism*) are they brought to here?

Law of Conſcience, judge their Church to be more holy than ANY other Congregation of Chriſtians? Were they ever *Heathens* to know this? But alas! what holineſs can a *Heathen* judge of? Surely not that which is an infallible mark of the true Church; for this Spiritual matter is fooliſhneſs to the Natural man, nor can he know it, becauſe 'tis ſpiritually diſcerned. It is true, there is *a Holineſs* diſcernable by the Law of our Conſciences. But this only, is not an infallible mark, that any Society is the Church of Chriſt; nor did ever any man (I am perſwaded) hold forth ſuch a Doctrine, that was a faithful Miniſter of the New Teſtament, or Spirit.

Again, What of this kind of *Holineſs*, whereof a *Heathen* (as ſuch) can judge, is there found among the *Papiſts*, which may not be found among the *Baptiſts*? yea, among thoſe that are oppoſite to both, as the *Quakers*, and others; yea, among the very *Jews* and *Turks* may be found as much of this kind of *Holineſs* as among the *Papiſts*, if any credit may be given to Hiſtories.

t would be here noted, That neither the rks of Unity, Univerſalilty, &c. *nor the eed, do preve a People that hath them all, e the Church; becauſe none of them men-* Baptiſm, *without which there cannot a viſible Church.*

Sometimes the *Papiſts* do object the *Creed* as ſufficient, to demonſtrate a man to be a Member of the Church, though he know not whether there be any Scripture. But I Anſwer, How ſhall this be proved to be the *Creed*? it muſt not be its own evidence; for then the Scripture may as well ſpeak for it ſelf, which the *Papiſts* will not allow; nor can the Church of *Rome* confer any authority upon the *Creed*, till they be found to be the Church: So then this is the Concluſion, *Rome* muſt be found to be the Church, before there be a *Creed*.

I do therefore humbly deſire theſe few Obſervations may be ſeriouſly thought upon by all ſober men, but eſpecially the *Papiſts*, that ſo men may give to the holy Scriptures, that which is proper to them; that is, That they may ſpeak, without controul, both for themſelves, and every thing elſe of a Religious conſideration; or elſe all Volumns of the Antients, and Societies of men, pretending to Chriſtianity (as things ſtand in our dayes) muſt depart into utter ſilence.

The Second Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, hath no Baptiſm: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Second Reaſon maintained.

BY the word *Baptiſm* in the Argument, I mean only the *Baptiſm of Water in the Name of the Father, &c.* or, which is all one, the *Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of ſins.* Now that the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* hath not this Baptiſm, is evident by this Argument, taken from their own Confeſſion, *viz.*

The Baptiſm of the true Church is found in the Scripture. But the Baptiſm of the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* is not grounded upon, nor mentioned in the Scripture. Therefore the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* hath no Baptiſm.

The firſt Propoſition is moſt clear, from *Matth.*28. 19,20. *Act.*2. *Act.* 8. *Act.* 9. *Act.* 16. *Act.* 18. *Act.* 19. *Act.* 22. 16. *Rom.* 6. *Gal.* 3. 27. *Col.*2.11, 12. *Heb.*6. 1, 2. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.

And, that the Papiſts Baptiſm is not found in the Scripture, I prove thus. Becauſe they themſelves do confeſs, that Infant Baptiſm is not mentioned in the Scripture, nor grounded upon the Scripture, nor any Scripture for it. See to this purpoſe, the Works of *Bellarmine*; and a Book, entituled, *An Antidote*, written by *S. N.* a Popiſh Doctor; as alſo *T. B.* his *End to Controverſie.* In which Books you will find the very words which I have repeated. Adde hereunto the Anſwer which I received from the Author of the *Seven Queries*, when *I* asked him what Controverſies in Religion he could reſolve without the written Word of God? he aſſigned *Infant Baptiſm*, as one that was ſo to be reſolved.

So then, we have it *pro confeſſo* from the Papiſts own mouths, That their Baptiſm (which is *Infant Baptiſm*) is a *Scriptureleſs-Baptiſm*: Therefore ſay I, it is no Baptiſm.

No Baptiſm, I ſay; becauſe the Church hath but one Baptiſm of Water, and it is mentioned in the Scripture, and grounded upon it, and much Scripture found for it; ſo is not *Infant Baptiſm*, which is the Baptiſm of the preſent Papal Church: Therefore the Papal Baptiſm, is no Baptiſm. How can they defend themſelves? Will they ſay, the Church hath a Scripture-Baptiſm, and an unwritten Baptiſm? Then they muſt ſeek for, and prove, or elſe deny their *Infant Baptiſm*.

But, secondly, The present Papal Church is so adulterated in the manner of the Administration of Baptism, as that, had they a true subject for Baptism, yet, they would be found to have no Baptism. This will appear as clear as the Light, from the Papists own confession; for they grant, *that the antient and primitive way of baptizing, was, by dipping the party baptized, over the head and ears in Water; and that it was their Church which changed this way, to a little sprinkling upon the forehead.* This is plainly to be seen in a Book, entituled, *Certamen Religiosum.*

This bold Change, which men, without any allowance from God, have made in this Ministration of Baptism, is directly against the Scripture. *Mat.* 3. 16. *Mark* 15. 9. *John* 3. 23. *Act.* 8, 38, 39. *Rom.* 6. In all which places it's evident, that our Lord Jesus, *John Baptist*, and the other *Baptists* of those times, did so understand the mind of God in respect of the manner of the Administration of Baptism, as that they thought it could not be done without so much Water as they might go into (both the Person baptizing, and the Person to be baptized) And now, do not all that will presume to satisfie themselves in this thing with a few drops of Water put on the face only, from a Man's fingers ends, or out of a Glass in the Midwifes pocket, lay great folly and ignorance to the charge of Christ and his primitive followers? doubtless such, as is not less than the folly of that man, that hath occasion only for one Gill of Water, and he may take it up at the side of the Brook, and yet will needs wade into the middle of a River to take it up; or a man that hath occasion to wash his hands only, which he may perform very commodiously without wetting his foot, and yet is so simple that he will needs go into the middle of the River to that purpose, especially such a River where there is much Water. I say, the practice of Sprinkling which the Papists and others use, if that answer the mind of God in the case of Baptism, doth even thus reflect upon Christ and the Christians in those dayes. But let our Saviours practice herein be justified, and all such practices as tend to the rendring it ridiculous, condemned.

The Papists only Reserve for the defence of *Infant Baptism*, is this: They say it is an *Apostolical Tradition*, that is, a Precept delivered by the Apostles Word, but not mentioned in their Writings.

This I shall shew to be utterly false, for divers important Reasons. First, No Apostolical Tradition, tends to the making null or void any Apostolical Writing. But Infant Sprinkling makes null and void all that is written in the Scriptures, concerning the subject and man-

ner of Baptism, in all that part of the World where the Papists (or such as they) get the Civil Power on their side: yea, we see that by this means the sons of men are great enemies to the way of God in this matter. How long have many Nations lain destitute of the knowledge of the *Baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins*, by reason of the interposition of this cloudy Tradition of *Pedo-Rantism*? How have men, pretending to be Ministers of Christ, never, in many Generations, preached *Peter*'s Doctrine, *Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, for the Remission of sins*? Note this Observation well; for although the Baptism of Repentance, *&c.* hath not been cryed down in the Nations of Christendom, (by such as counted themselves the only Preachers of the Gospel) yet it was not for that these Nations had no need of the practice of Baptism; for they daily have practised something under that notion, which is their Infant-sprinkling; So that it's plain, Infant-Baptism makes void the Apostolical Writings: Therefore Infant-Baptism is no Apostolical Tradition.

Secondly, Infant-Baptism is not an Apostolical Tradition, because no mention is made of it in the first hundred of years after Christ. Although I am not much read, yet I have used the utmost of my diligence to know the Truth in this Point, and I have attained to sufficient satisfaction, that the greatest favourer of Infant-Baptism that yet I have met with, durst not say that ever he saw any Record of Antiquity that mentioned such a thing, and that the Scriptures do not mention it, the Papists grant.

And because the Papists make such boast of the consent which they have in this matter from Antiquity, I will therefore here put in something by way of Evidence to the contrary. For it is certain that Infant Baptism, as it was not heard of in the first hundred, so neither was it generally received till above half a thousand years revolved from Christ, as is undeniable; for that it is plain, that the most famous (or at least, very famous) Christian Parents brought up their Children without having them baptized; such were the Parents of *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and others; yea, the Emperour *Constantius*, born of Christian Parents, was not baptized till he was about thirty years of age*. See also these ensuing Testimonies.

* *See a Book, entituled, A well grounded Treatise concerning Baptism.*

I will declare unto you, how we offer up our selves unto God in Baptism. After that we are renewed through Christ, such as are instructed in the Faith, and believe that which we teach them, being to live according to the same; we admonish to fast and pray, and we fast and pray with them; then they are brought to the Water, *Justin Mart. Apol. 2. ad Antoninum.*

and there calling on the Name of the Father, &c. they are washed *in it*. So saith *Erasmus*, *paraphrase* on *Matth.*28. *If they believe that which you teach them, and begin to be repentant of their former life, then dip them* In Water, *In the Name, &c.*

rom. per at.28 The Lord commanded his Apostles, that they should first instruct all Nations, and afterward *baptise* those that were instructed: for it cannot be that the body should receive the Sacrament of Baptism, unless the soul have received *before* the true Faith.

ithan. serm. cont. rrian. Our Saviour did not slightly command to baptize, but first of all he said, *teach*, and then *baptize*, that true Faith might come by *teaching*, and Baptism be perfected by *Faith*.

Haimo. postil. p. text *Haimo* saith, *In this place* (Matth. 28.) *is set down a Rule rightly how to baptize*, that is, *that Teaching should go before Baptism: for*, he saith, *Teach all Nations*, (and then he saith) *and baptize them: for, he that is to be baptized, must be before instructed, that he first learn to believe, that which in Baptism he shall receive: For, as Faith without Works is dead; so Works, if they have no Faith, are nothing worth.*

eda per ct.19. *Beda* saith, *All they that came to the Apostles to be baptized, were instructed of them, and when they were instructed concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, they received the holy administration thereof.*

ertul. ui sunt apt. arvil. *Tertullian*, who lived about the time when Infant-Baptism began to appear, did dispute against it, as an unnecessary practice, for divers causes. 1. *For that it is not meet to commit heavenly things, to those who are not capable of keeping treasure of an earthly nature.* 2. *For that the Sponsors might be endangered.* 3. *For that it became them that were to be baptized, to fast, pray, and confess their sins.* 4. *Because they that receive Christ, must ask him; let them* (that is, little ones) *come therefore*, saith he, *while they are youths, whilst wherein they come, they are taught, &c.*

Aug. de Civitat. Dei. *Augustine* saith, *We spend much time in exhorting those whom we baptize* — *Ludovicus vives*, commenting upon this place, saith, *Lest any man should mistake this place of* Augustine, *let him know that in old time it was the custom to baptize* NONE, *except they were of full age, and did desire Baptism in their own persons, and that several times, and did understand what that Mystical Water meant, which we see resembled in our baptizing of Infants.*

[Lo here your Pedo-baptism is not the old custom of the Church.]

The Third Reason.

The present Papal Church of *Rome*, is a National Church: Therefore she is not the Church of Christ.

The third Reason maintained.

1. TO make the Gospel-Church National, consequently destroyes the Doctrin of Conversion, as it is a principle of the Doctrin of Christ appertaining to the beginning of a Christian man: For, if men can regenerate, or beget persons to God in their infancy, then the Word of Regeneration or new-birth is needless in order to our admission into the Church of Christ, and so the preaching of Faith and Repentance must cease (*as it is a Principle pertaining to a Christian man*) in all those Nations which are called *Christendom*, which is a great part of the World. And indeed, Experience hath long ago proved this Conclusion to be most true; for since the Church (as they term it) was National, the Word, or Work of Conversion, hath been little known in the life and power of it: nay, verily, the very term [*Conversion*] is become a reproach among our National-Church-members. But thus to make the Word of Conversion unnecessary, in order to persons admission into the Church of Christ, is contrary to the Scripture, *John* 3. 5. *Luke* 24. 47. *Matth.* 20. 19. 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17. *Heb.* 8. 10, 11. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28. *Matth.* 3. 8, 9, 10.

2. To make the Gospel-Church National, puts an end to the Doctrine of Christ touching that Separation, and those Divisions, which for the Gospel-sake *must be in Nations and Families*, as appears from these Scriptures; *John* 15. 19. and 17. 14, 16. *Acts* 2. 40, 47. 1 *Cor.* 6. *Luke* 12. 49, to 54. And therefore in vain doth any person think to do God service, by compelling Families, Towns, Countries, Nations, or many Nations, to be of one mind in matters of Religion. I say, it is in vain, because the Scripture foresees, and also foreshews, that the contrary effects must follow the preaching of the Gospel; and yet they may, yea, and ought to live in one form of Civil Government: for that is the will of God concerning *every Soul*, *Rom.* 13. 1, to 8.

3. The Gospel-Church cannot be National; because that takes away from her, Persecution for the Gospel-sake, & makes her become a Persecutor: For it is impossible for a Church to be National without penal Laws, whereby to force men to that kind of Worship which

the greater part approveth, which may as possibly be false as true. But the true Church must not look to be free from Persecution, if she live godly in *Christ Jesus*; nor is any thing more † *uncomly* for her than to punish or persecute men into a Conformity to her Faith or religious practice, *John* 15. 19, 20. *Mat.* 10. 22. 2 *Tim.* 3. 12. *Luke* 9. 56. And the greatest part of the *Revelations* do shew, that the Church was to be in a suffering condition, and are therefore bid to *be patient, until the coming of the Lord*, Jam. 5.

Cor. 10.

4. A National-Church cannot observe the discipline of the Church of Christ; for, in the case of withdrawing from disorderly persons, they do not only separate men of disorder from the Church, both in Civil and Religious concerns, but they cast them wholly out of the World, from all Markets and Fairs, yea, quite out of their Livelihoods, *&c.* which kind of Excommunication the Scripture foresees to be proper to the Churches Adversary, *Rev.* 13. 16, 17.

5. If the Gospel-Church ought to be National, then she was imperfect in point of Power in the Apostles dayes: for she had not then any Power to put Hereticks to death for their Heresie. But to say, that the Primitive Church wanted any Power to punish any sin, as it concerns the Church to punish it, is to disparage the Apostolical Churches, and is also contrary to the Scriptures, which plainly shew they had Power then to revenge all disobedience, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5, 6.

The Fourth Reason.

The Papal Church encreaseth her self more by the Carnal Sword, than by the Spiritual Word: Therefore she is not the Church of Christ.

The fourth Reason maintained.

THat such Churches as are National, do most encrease their numbers, and keep them also when they have them, by the terror of Death and Penal Laws, both Experience shews, and Reason tels that it cannot be otherwise. How often hath our Nation changed their Religion, with the breath of a Prince? sometime to *Popery*, and otherwhiles to *Protestancy*, and under *O. Cromwel* to a compound of half *Presbytery* and half *Independency*, according to the temper of those that sat at the Stern of Affairs? And now, how are they turn'd again to *Prelacy*? Of which last change, I say, if any have conformed, as

judging it their duty to God so to do, those (though this doth not justifie their way to be good, yet) are honest men: But if any for self-interest have done it, they are the very dregs of men, and will be any thing, and so nothing.

2. I remember a notable saying of *Hillary*, who lived about the 4th or 5th hundred, and in his dayes the Church was a degenerating from her Regeneral Constitution into a National Form, where he saith, *Ambition doth aid it self by the Name of CHRIST; the Church doth fear and compel the People through Banishments and Imprisonment, to believe her in those things, which she had received through being imprisoned— She that could not be beloved of Christ if the World had not hated her, now glorieth to be extolled and beloved of the World, &c.* *Hill. cont. Aus.*

And that the Papal Church hath ordinarily encreased her self more by terror of the Carnal Sword than the Word of God, doleful Histories do declare; namely these, *Sleidan Comment.* A Book entituled, *The Indians Tears*, or, *Inquisition for Blood:* as also, *Fox his Acts and Monuments.*

And here I think it meet to give an instance from one of their own Historiagraphers, namely *Fabinus.* He tells us that after *Austin* the Monk had gotten a considerable settlement in *England*, it happened that there was a Council assembled in this Nation, where *Austin* proposed several things, to which the other Bishops could not consent; but, by your leave, when *Austin* could not prevail by the Word (or rather, his words) he told them, *If they would not submit, they should be compelled, by the wasting that should be made in their Country through War and Misery.* This was not *Paul's* way, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20.

The Fifth Reason.

The present Papal Church of *Rome*, labours to keep the World in darkness, and the Church also: Therefore she is not the Church of Christ.

The fifth Reason maintained.

THe Consequence of this Argument no man can deny; for there is nothing more opposit to the true Church, than to love, or cause darkness to seize upon any. And that the present Papal Church of *Rome* labours to keep all men in darkness, is thus proved. 1. She forbids almost all men to reade the Scriptures, and thereupon hath

greatly withstood the Translation of them into every Tongue, as is evident, partly from what History declares, and partly from that which themselves do say. To omit History, hear what they say themselves. In their Preface to the Reader in the *Rhemist Testament*, thus they speak:

Order was taken by the Deputies of the late famous Council of Trent *in this behalf, and confirmed by Supream Authority, That the Scripture, though truly translated into the vulgar Tongues, yet may not be indifferently read of all men, nor of any other than such as have expreß Order thereunto of their lawful Ordinaries.* So that we see the Liberty here given, is unlike the Liberty given by Christ to his enemies, whom he commanded to search the Scripture, *John* 5. 39. And the rich Glutton's Friends are said to have the *Prophets* and *Moses*, Luk. 16. 29. *Israel* was of old indifinitly required to lay up the Book of the Law in their heart; to talk of it as they sate in their houses; as they went abroad; they must teach them to their children, and write them upon the posts of their doors, *Deut.* 6. 4, to 9.

Notwithstanding all this and much more liberty given by the Lord both to his Enemies and Friends, to reade his Word, you see the *Council of Trent* will have none permitted, but whom the Ordinaries permit, to reade the Scripture, and they are only such as they judge discreet, &c. *Pref. Rhem. Test.*

Is it not strange that men, pretending to be Christ's true Followers, should thus contradict him? He allowed that to his Enemies, which they will not allow to his Friends. Sure they have neither heard his Voice, nor seen his Shape, or, at least, not learned of him. Miserable is the Gospel-Church by the Council of *Trents* Doctrine, they have not that priviledge which *Israel* under the Law was allowed; and yet they are as strictly bound *to bring up their Children in the admonition of the Lord*; which they cannot do, unless they have the Law in their heart, that so they may talk of it to their Children. But surely, those that will not let the Law come within the sight of our eyes, have no mind it should ever come in our hearts: So then they labour to keep us in the dark.

What can they say against mens reading the Scripture, which hath not the same force against the hearing of it preached? Did not some conceive as gross opinions concerning Christ's saying, men must eat his flesh, as some have by reading them? The *Jews* thought they were so to be understood, as that they might eat his *real flesh*; and that was not a greater nor a lesse Error, than is found in the *Papists*, who read the same word. It is doubtless a shrewd sign that those

who will not ſuffer us to *ſee* the Law of God, do not intend that we ſhall *hear* very much of it; peradventure ſuch Points as talk of Tythes, *&c.*

Yea, it is evident, that they intend not to let us hear much that ſhall profit us; for they have deviſed, that the very Prayers and Services of their Church, be ſaid and ſung in a tongue which the People underſtand not. Yea, they tell us, *That it is enough for the People to underſtand that the Prayer is made to call upon God in all our deſires; and more than this is not neceſſary (they ſay:)* So that the poor People in the Papacy, know not what are the things deſired; only they are told, The Prayer is made to God in all that is therein deſired. Are not theſe People kept in darkneſs? But ſaith *Paul, How ſhould the unlearned ſay*, Amen? 1 *Cor.* 14.

That which is moſt ſtrange, is, That the Papiſts ſhould deliver this dark Doctrine, from 1 *Cor.* 14. then which no Scripture more requireth an underſtanding in thoſe that pray, and in thoſe that joyn with them; nor doth any Scripture more clearly ſhew us, to how little purpoſe it is to perform any Service in the Church in an unknown tongue. Read the Chapter; ſaith *Paul*, *If I come unto you ſpeaking with tongues, what ſhall I profit you?* —— but *in the Church I will ſpeak five words with my underſtanding, that I may inſtruct others alſo, rather than ten thouſand words in an unknown tongue.* Theſe are *Paul's* words, as the Papiſts themſelves tranſlate them.

Another way whereby they keep men in darkneſs is this, They cumber mens minds with ſuch a MULTITUDE of Ceremonies, and Repetitions in their Prayers, that the mind is ſufficiently charged to remember how many times over they muſt ſay ſome two or three words; nay, it's evident this is no wrong, witneſs their Beads which ſerve to ſupply the defect of their memories. As I remember, there is not leſs than fifty Orations and Poſtulations, *&c.* which the Prieſt is to make, and act, before the Bread be Conſecrated when they ſay Maſs; and the like doings they have in the moſt of their Services, which I can more deſire the Lord would deliver them from, than mention. *Willis Synop*

The

The Sixth Reason.

The present Papal Church, is generally (if not only at this day) gathered of persons unregenerate, or not new born, as the Scriptures do require new-birth in that case: Therefore she is not the Church of Christ.

The Sixth Reason maintained.

1. THe Scripture saith, That *except a man* (or any one) *be born again* (SO) as to be like the winde *THAT BLOWETH*, and that bloweth in such sort, as the sound thereof *IS HEARD*, *he cannot enter into the Kingdom* (or Church) *of God*: But the many millions of Infants, whereof the Papal Church consists mostly (if not only) in respect of her Members Initiation, are not thus regenerate. So that the Papal Church is gathered (generally) of such Persons as are not so regenerate, as Persons oughtto be, and must of necessity be, before they be admitted into the Church of Christ. The Seed of the Woman (or Gospel-Church) are all such as have the Faith of Jesus, and keep the Commandments of God, at least in Profession; for that is the thing that is absolutely necessary, in order to any Person's admission into the Church of Christ, *John* 3. 5, 6. 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17. *Rev.* 12. *ult.* *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28.

2. All the Children of the new Covenant, or Church of Christ, do *DIFFER* from the Church under *Moses*, *SO*, as that they, each individual, do so know the Lord, as that they need not, in some sort, teach *one another*, saying, *Know the Lord*, Heb. 8. Jer. 31. But either all, or the generality of the Papal Church, differ nothing from the Church under *Moses*, in respect of their *KNOWLEDGE*, when admitted into their Church, Being such as are not capable of the first, or least degree of the knowledge of him.

3. There appears no more sign of Regeneration, or new-Birth, in the Infants, or Members of the Papal Church, at their admission, than there appears in such as the Papists say are not regenerate. Now where the Spirit of regeneration is, it is not without some demonstrable operation; for saith Christ, *The wind bloweth*, &c. *and thou heareſt the sound thereof*, &c. *SO IS EVERY* One that is born of the Spirit. So that I conclude, That the Infants whom the Papists say they baptize, are not born of the Spirit, unless they can give some demonstrative sign of it.

4. There can be no Regeneration in an ordinary way, without preaching the Doctrine of Christ, *Rom.*10. But the Papal Church is generally (if not only) gathered without the Word preached, in order to the regeneration of the Members, before their admission. Therefore they are not regenerate in an ordinary way. And if they have an extraordinary regeneration, let them shew it.

The Seventh Reason.

The present Papal Church of *Rome*, maintaineth the Doctrine of Devils, and that so violently, as that they punish the Non-observation thereof with Excommunication and Death: Therefore she is not the Church of Christ.

This Argument maintained.

THis Reason, or Argument, may seem to be harshly laid down; yet if it be true, there is necessity to propound it. And for the truth of it, I desire you weigh what followeth.

1. To forbid Marriage, and to command to abstain from Meats which God hath created to be received, of such as believe and obey the Truth; this is the doctrine of Devils. But it is well known that the Papists do forbid the whole Calling of their Clergy to Marry, and thousands beside of those that live in their Monasteries and Nunries, *&c.* and this under pain of *Cursing* and *Death*. You shall hear them speak their own words, wherein they do not only prohibit Marriage for ever to such as enter into the Ministry; but if any be married, and afterwards come into the Ministry, they wholly deprive such of the enjoyment of their Yoke-fellows. Thus they speak; *The cause why the Church requireth chastity in the Clergie, and forbiddeth not only fornication, but all carnal copulation, even in lawful wedlock, is to the end, that God's Priests be not divided from him by the clogs of Marriage, but be clean and pure from all the fleshly acts of copulation:* And this doctrine they teach from 1 *Cor.*7. where if you reade the 4, 5, 6, 7. *verses*, you may easily learn the quite contrary Doctrine. Again, They teach from 1 *Tim.*3.2. *That none shall Marry that come into holy Orders.* And, *that if any of the Clergie, in other Countries, had been permitted, in times past, to enjoy their Wives, yet they now declare it to be against the Apostles Rule; And this they say is the Sentence of the Council of* Nice. But surely *Paul's* words are clear

Rhem. Test. Annot.

Rhem. Test. Annot.

contrary; for he saith, *A Bishop must be the Husband of one Wife, having his Children in subjection*, &c.

In further proof of this matter, it is upon Record, That *Greg.7. An.* 1070. did enforce Ministers by Excommunication, to leave their
l. 32 Wives. And *Urban* 2. *Anno.* 1066. Decreed, That it might be
10. lawful to make the Ministers Wives bond-women. And *Fox* recordeth, That it was made Felony, by the Act of the *Six Articles*, for Ministers to marry Wives, *Fox*, *p.*1135. And this cruelty *Bellarmine* defends by a saying of *Jerome*, That a Bishop begetting Children, shall be condemned as an Adulterer.

Now whereas I say they forbid Meats, *&c.* I do not mean, that it is not meet for the Church to Fast and Pray, and in such a sense to forbid meat. But for their Church to forbid one kind of meat above another; as that we may not eat Eggs in Lent, and divers other creatures which God hath created, to be received of such as believe. For the true way of Fasting, is a total fasting for the time (unless necessity deny.) And truly the Papal Fast of Lent is in a manner no Fast, which allows the drinking of Wines, and the eating to the full of such delicacies as do inflame the flesh as much as Eggs, *&c.* which yet the Papists by no means will permit men to eat. For my Author tells me, That they make the eating of Eggs in Lent, a damnable sin. *Fox*, *p.*1043. I might fill much Paper about their forbidding meats. But to proceed:

The Eighth Reason.

The present Papal Church of *Rome*, is Mystery Babylon: Therefore she is not the Church of Christ.

The Eighth Reason maintained.

1. I Know, that generally all that dissent from *Rome*, do account her as in her present state to be *Mystery Babylon*; And truly for my part, I have considered of this matter, and I find it is so clearly meant of *Rome*, that even the Papists do not wholly exempt her from this Name. Yet they deny that *Rome*, as now considered, is *Mystery Babylon*; only, say they, it is to be referred to *Rome* in her *Heathenish* estate. But thus I reason;

2. If the present Papal Church of *Rome* be not *Mystery Babylon*, then either the Papists, or some body else, can shew us a People which better deserves that title. But this no man can do (so far as yet I have learned) and therefore (as yet) I must say,

The present Papal Church of *Rome* (together with her Daughter Churches) is *Mystery Babylon*. And for further proof in this Point, I thus reason:

3. The present Papal Church hath the Marks of *Mystery Babylon*; therefore she is *Mystery Babylon*.

I prove it thus:

One Mark of *Mystery Babylon*, is a Regiment over the Kings of the Earth, *Rev.* 17. *The Woman which thou sawest, is that great City which reigneth over the Kings of the Earth.* This Mark the present Papal Church of *Rome* hath above all other; Witness the Papists own Books, *T. B. End to Contrev. chap.* 26, 27. where he sets up the Pope above all Kings and Emperors; and plainly calls the Popes, Kings and Monarchs; and the Papal Church, he terms an invincible Empress, *&c.*

Another Mark of *Mystery Babylon*, is great Riches and wordly Pomp. That *Rome*, in her present Church-state, hath this Mark, her Doctor, *T. B.* is my witness. So is *Helen. Geog. p.* 192, 193. and *Napier*, *Rev.* 9. which Authors shew her Riches (even of the Clergy only) to be quite out of the reach of the best Arithmaticks to pass an *Entrado* upon it. Add to all other witnesses that of *Experience*, and it will shew us, That when their Church had her domination in this Land, they knew where the best Ground lay; as the Ruins of their Abbeys do evince. Compare all these with *Rev.* 18. and see if they do not agree.

Another Mark of *Mystery Babylon* is, She sits upon Nations, Tongues, and Peoples. *Rome* hath this Mark; *T. B.* in his *End to Controversies*, *chap.* 26, 27.

Another Mark of *Mystery Babylon* is, She enslaves the Souls of men, and is drunk with blood. Now that the Papal Church of *Rome* hath this Mark, I need only to refer my Readers to those large Histories of *Sleidan*, *Fox*, and *Benzo* the *Italian*.

Lastly, As I noted, it is confessed by the Papists, That *Mystery Babylon*, *Rev.* 17. & 18. *chapters*, is meant of *Rome*; only they think to free themselves from the force of that blow, by telling us, That it's meant of *Rome* in her *Heathenism*, and under the persecuting Emperors. But this is but a poor shift, as may appear, by shewing, That the Antients do write against *Rome*, as *Mystery Babylon*, after the persecuting Emperors were down; for the Papists say, *That* Constatine *put an end to the Persecution, when he was converted*, which was about the year 300, and a few odd years; at which time *Fab. Chron.*

the Papists say, *Then* Rome *was given up to the Pope.* 2. *Jerome*, who lived about the fourth hundred, writing to *Eustoch.* & *Marcellu*, doth apply these words to *Rome*, viz. *Fly out of* Babylon, *let every man save his own Soul, for* Babylon *is fallen, and is become the Habitation of Devils.* Yea, he saith further, as he is quoted by the Protestants, *That* Rome *IS the* Babylonical *Harlot, according to the Revelation of St.* John, *appointed for the birth of Antichrist, which there should arise, and exercise all tyranny; and from thence should deceive the whole world with his wicked Wiles.*

And *Augustine* is most clear in this matter, in his Book of the *City of God*; where he calls *Rome* another *Babylon* in the West. And *Babylon* in the East, first *Rome*: and *Rome* of *Italy*, second *Babylon*. Willing men to consider, That in the beginning of the *City of God*, which was in *Abraham*'s time, the first *Rome*, that was, Eastern *Babylon* was builded in *Chaldea*. And about what the first *Babylon* was destroyed, lest the *City of God* should want her Enemy, the second *Babylon*, which is *Rome* in *Italy*, was erected.

Chrysostome saith, *Antichrist shall invade the vacant Empire of* Rome, *and assay to draw unto himself the Empires both of God and man.* Thus it seems that *Rome* was accounted *Mystery Babylon*, four or five hundred years after Christ; and if she be not now, what she was then in that respect, I desire to be informed where that blood-drunken Fornicatrix, mentioned, *Revelation* 17. is now to be found.

The Ninth Reason.

The present Papal Church hath not those Marks, which they themselves assign as the Marks by which the true Church can only be known infallibly: Therefore the present Papal Church of *Rome*, is not the Church of Christ.

Those Marks are;

1. *ANTIQUITY.*	4. *VISABILITY.*
2. *SUCCESSION.*	5. *SANCTITY.*
3. *UNIVERSALITY* (*of Time and Place.*	6. *UNITY.*
	7. *MIRACLES*, &c.

These are the Principal.

The Ninth Reason maintained.

THat the present Papal Church cannot have the true Mark of *Antiquity*, is thus evidenced; *viz.* The Papal Church is a National Church; But no Gospel Church was National in the first Age: Therefore no National Church hath the true Mark of *Antiquity*.

The strength of this Argument lyeth in the clear difference of the state of the Church under *Abraham* and *Moses*, to what it was under Christ and his Apostles. For,

The *Jewish* Church, which was to be National, took its form in a National way, even in the very first Family where it began, as appears, *Gen.* 17. where Parents, Children, and Servants too, must all be brought into that Church-state forthwith, or not be suffered to co-habit together. Which order must be kept in all the Families of the *Jews*, as well in respect of their Servants, such as they bought with money, as their Children, or any other. And so the *Jewish* Church, both in its beginning and its continuance, acted forth it self in a way suitable to it self.

Luke 12 But when the Gospel Church began, it is very evident, that it
52, took its beginning in the division of Families, and that by vertue
53. of Christ's Doctrine; who affirms, That he came to send fire on the
Matt. 10 Earth; not Peace, but rather Division: For saith he, *From hence-*
35. *forth there shall be fire, in one house divided three against two, and two*
Luke, *against three; the Father against the Son, and the Son against the Father;*
16. *the Daughter against the Mother, and the Mother against the Daughter,*
Mar. 7. 29. *and all this for the Gospel sake.* Here a man must leave Father,
, 13, Mother, Wife and Children; For this cause ye shall be betrayed,
, 21, both by Parents and Kinsfolks. For this cause the unbelieving
, 23. Husband will put away his believing Wife. And for this cause
the Servant may refuse to follow his unbelieving Master, being
Christ's freeman, and yet dwell in his Service as a Servant notwith-
standing.

Thus it's evident, That the Gospel-Church took its beginning in a way quite contrary to the Form of a National Church, even by turning the World (or Church of the *Jews*) up-side down, which caused the *Jews* to cry out, *MEN OF ISRAEL, HELP.*

This is yet more evident, by that thundring Doctrine of the
Mat. 3. *Baptist*, when he said, *Think not, or begin not to say within your selves,*
9. *We have* Abraham *to our Father.* No, saith *Paul*, *We* (meaning the
Cor. 5. Gospel-Church) *which are of Faith, are the Seed of* Abraham, *and*
Gal. 6, 7, *Heirs according to Promise*; For the Promise (which chiefly) is en-
18. joyed in the Gospel, was not made to such as were born after the
Gal. 3. 2 Flesh, but such as are born after the Spirit; Whereupon he saith,
6, 29. We henceforth know No man after the Flesh [or because he de-
Acts 10 scends from the loins of *Abraham*, or any other.] For if any man
35. be in Christ (so as to be a demonstrable or visible Member of his
Rom. 9. Gospel-Church) he is a new-creature. Old things are passed away,
6, 7, 8. [yea, the old priviledge of standing in the Church by the Father's interest, though the Seed of *Abraham* himself] is [now] passed, behold all things [in this respect] are become new. Whereupon *Peter* contributeth his sentence, and saith, *Of a truth I perceive God is no respecter of Persons*, [*but* the Persons accepted upon a Gospel-account, so as to be his Church, are such as *in every Nation fear him, and work Righteousness* [which no *Infant* can do.] But what? Hath God rejected *Infants* wholly, that now he will not shew them so much favour as afore-time? God forbid. He hath not shut up his tender Mercies from them wholly, or in part; For as they are such, and

dying in their infancy through *Adam's* transgression, so in Christ shall they be made alive. Wherefore look how far soever they fall in the first man of the Earth, so far they shall be restored by the Lord from Heaven; yea, the Gift to them by Christ shall exceed the Loss they had by *Adam*. But if they live to years of understanding, and become actual sinners against God, then the way appointed for the remission of their sins, is, *to repent, and be baptized, every one of them, that they may receive the holy Ghost*, and so be by it led *into all Truth; and attain at the end the salvation of their souls, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* Rom. 16, 17. Acts 38, to 41.

Another Argument whereby it appears the Church of Christ cannot be National, is this; No man is bound to become a Christian under pain of corporal punishment, as Death, &c. but living peaceably as men, no man hath power to compel them to be baptized, or to walk in the Christian Profession, as is clear from the Texts before recited. Now take away Force in matters of Religion, and a National Church cannot stand in an absolute National Form; this all experience can testifie.

Again, That the Church of Christ at the first, or in the first Ages was not National (in the first method or way wherein a Church beginneth to be so, namely, by the admission of Infants into the Church) is very evident; because it is utterly incredible, that the many thousands of Infants, of such as in those dayes believed, should be admitted into the Church, and not so much as the whisper of such a thing to be found in all the holy Writings of the Apostles. And beside, I have shewed from the Testimony of *Vives*, (*Augustines* Commentor) That the Church had not the custom to baptize Infants in old time.

It is likewise certain (if History be true) That the Gospel-Church used no compulsion in matters of Faith for more than three hundred years after Christ. About which time *Constantine* ordained grievous punishments for such as spake against Christ; and allowed the *Christians*, to use the Unbelievers hardly. But God did not bless these doings: for *Constantine* became an *Arrian* Heretick, and persecuted the Bishop that baptized him, as also others that continued faithful. *Fab. Chron. 4th part. Yet this* Eusebius *doth seem to contradict.*

Hence then I conclude, That seeing the present Papal Church of *Rome* hath not the true Mark of Antiquity, Therefore they lose at once, the next three, *Succession*, *Universality*, and *Visibility*: For,

Antiquity